

PROCEEDINGS



National Convention
of the
Socialist Party



1 9 0 8



NATIONAL CONVENTION
OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY

HELD AT
Chicago Illinois, May 10 to 17, 1908

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT BY
Wilson E. McDermut, assisted by Charles W. Phillips
and Isabel MacLean

Edited by
JOHN M. WORK

Published by
THE SOCIALIST PARTY

J. MAHLON BARNES, National Secretary

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

4-1923
BOUND NOV

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

National Convention, Socialist Party

Held in Chicago, Ill., May 10 to 17, 1908

FIRST DAY'S SESSION



123

The Third National Convention of the Socialist Party of America met at Brand's Hall, Chicago, Illinois, Sunday, May 10, 1908, at 12 o'clock noon.

The National Secretary, J. Mahlon Barnes, called the convention to order as follows:

"Chicago, May 10, 1908.

"Comrades: The National Constitution of the Socialist Party provides that the National Committee shall decide the time and place of holding national conventions. By a vote of the National Committee closing Jan. 14, 1908, Chicago was chosen as the city, and by a vote closing Feb. 4, 1908, this day, May 10th, was selected for the assembling of the national convention. In accordance with the above record and by authority of the National Committee of the Socialist Party, I now call the national convention of the Socialist Party to order. The first thing will be the nomination of a temporary chairman. Nominations will be in order."

Temporary Organization.

Del. Hillquit, of New York, was chosen chairman of the session.

Del. Hillquit on taking the chair, spoke as follows:

Comrades, contrary to the usual custom, I shall not make a speech. I have figured out, comrades, that this convention will spend about \$15,000. Figuring at the rate of six days, it means \$2,500 a day. On the basis of the eight-hour working day, that is \$300 an hour, or \$5 a minute. Now, comrades, every point of order made here costs \$10 to the party. Every appeal from the decision of the chair is \$15. Every ten minutes consumed is \$50. I think I have myself already expended something like \$8 of the party's money so far. I call your attention to that in order that we may remember the virtue of brevity in our discussions. And I think, comrades, we will best bear it in mind if you will just remember at all times, first, that we have some very important matters and some that are very much less essential, and that we want to preserve some measure of proportion. Next, when a limit of time is assigned to you, say five or ten minutes, you have the right to consume all of the time, but you do not have the absolute duty to do so. Again, I suppose you will remember the duties before us and the fact that among all these 219 delegates there is not one who

511236

does not have the best interests of his party at heart and therefore we will avoid all sorts of acrimony in our discussions. We will now proceed to the business of the convention. What is your pleasure?

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I wish to make a motion, in adopting rules governing the preliminary proceedings, that all speeches for any purpose whatever during this organization be limited to three minutes. (Seconded.)

Carried.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move that we proceed to the election of a temporary secretary.

The motion was seconded and carried.

DEL. Heath of Wisconsin was elected temporary secretary.

Communications.

The secretary read the following communications:

London, May 9, 1908.—Chairman, National Convention Socialist Party, Chicago. National Council, Independent Labor Party, Great Britain sends fraternal greetings and best wishes for success of convention. (Signed) Ramsay McDonald, M. P., Chairman; Francis Johnson, Secretary. (Applause.)

(Translation:) National Convention Socialist Party, Chicago. We wish you perfect agreement in your councils and success in the coming battle. (Signed) Social Democratic Party of Austria, per Scari. (Applause.)

Greetings to the convention of Socialist Party, Chicago. Our local comrades to all comrades to the convention and National Committee greetings. (Signed) Bohemian Local, Socialist Party, Bridgeport, Ohio.

West Concord, New Hampshire, May 7, 1908.—To the delegates and comrades in convention assembled, greeting. Being unable to attend the convention on account of illness at home, I wish to join my alternate comrades Arnstein of Dover and Wilkins, our State Secretary, delegates from New Hampshire in extending to you the hearty co-operation of the Socialists of New Hampshire, wishing you God speed in your deliberations in this convention, which is destined to be a history-making event. The eyes of the world are upon you. The arch enemy, capitalism, through its

blinded tools, is watching for the breaking of the fraternal bonds. The militant proletarian hordes are watching you, expecting a policy and position so firm and strong that it will be insurmountable, and a platform so clear, scientific and revolutionary, that it will carry consternation into the enemy's ranks, inspire the hearts of the toilers with zeal and interest until the millions shall declare for the Socialist cause. We hope to have the honor, privilege and pleasure of voting for William D. Haywood as our standard bearer of 1908. Fraternal yours, W. H. McFall, State Organizer. (Applause.)

Baltimore, Md., May 8, 1908.—Chairman, National Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago, Ill. Branch 44, Workmen's Circle sends fraternal greeting.

Pittsburg, Pa., May 10, 1908.—Permanent Chairman, Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall, Chicago. Accept greetings from Pittsburg victims of a plutocratic prosperity. Hope this convention will mark an epoch in the history of the inevitable emancipation of the class conscious workers. (Signed) 7th and 8th Ward Branch.

Baltimore, Md., May 10.—Chairman National Socialist Convention. Branch 6, Socialist Party, Baltimore, sends fraternal greetings and rises to second the nomination of Debs. (Signed) H. Grossman.

New York City, May 10, 1908.—Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall, Heartiest greetings to you all. May your work be crowned with success. Three cheers for Socialism. (Signed) Arbeiter Ring, Branch 1.

Committee on Credentials.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I move that a committee of seven be appointed to pass on the credentials and report to this convention, to decide who are delegates and who are not. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move as an amendment that that committee of seven be elected by the convention and not appointed. (Seconded.)

The following nominees accepted the nomination for committee on credentials: Reilly, Utermann, Clark, Boylan, Graham, Tuck, Solomon, Schwartz, Boomer, Gaylord.

It was moved and seconded that the ten nominees accepting constitute the committee. Carried.

Letter to President of U. S.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I would like to get unanimous consent of the convention to a very important matter that will not take over \$5 worth of time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Hoehn of Missouri applies for unanimous consent to speak one minute on a very urgent matter. Is there any objection to the request of Comrade Hoehn? There seems to be no objection. Comrade Hoehn has sixty seconds for an urgent matter.

DEL. HOEHN: Mr. Chairman and Comrades, I believe the United States Supreme Court is not in session to-

Chairman Hillquit called the convention to order at 3 o'clock.

Report of Committee on Rules Elected By National Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand the Credentials Committee is not ready to report yet. Now, if you do not want to waste any time I suggest that we take up the following business:

The National Committee some time ago elected a Committee on Rules. That committee was not elected by the convention, but I understand it has performed its duties and has its report ready. I would suggest that this convention might ratify the election and make that committee a committee of the convention. I further suggest that we start in with the consideration of the rules. While it is not fully in accord with parliamentary practice, we can discuss it and we might assume that as we will when organized as a convention confirm our action, in this way we might save considerable time while waiting for the Committee on Credentials. If the convention agrees with the proposition I will entertain motions to that effect.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I move you that both suggestions be concurred in, namely, that the committee be ratified and that we proceed with the consideration of the report. (Seconded.) Carried.

day, hence it cannot take out an injunction against the introduction of the following open letter to President Roosevelt:

"Open letter to President Roosevelt, White House, Washington, D. C.:—Chicago, Ill., May 10, 1908. Sir:—In your last special message to Congress you raised the question of class consciousness; as the highest executive officer of this great American Republic—"

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I rise to a point of order. That is by no stretch of the imagination a question of urgency.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken.

It was voted to hand in the credentials and adjourn until 3 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Before the report is read I suggest—there is no motion necessary—that the Committee on Rules read their suggestions, and unless there is objection, without any formal action, that it be considered as carried as the sense of the body, to save time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless there is any objection to this mode of procedure, it will be followed.

Del. Stedman then read the following report:

The Committee on Rules respectfully reports the following for the rules and order of business governing this convention:

1. A chairman shall be elected at the commencement of each day's session.

2. A permanent secretary and two assistants shall be elected for the entire convention and may be selected from outside the body of delegates.

3. The secretary may select one or more reading clerks to assist him.

4. A sergeant-at-arms and assistants shall be appointed by the chairman at the first day's session, such sergeant-at-arms and assistants to act throughout the entire convention.

5. The sergeant-at-arms shall appoint five pages and five messengers who shall act under his supervision.

6. Four tellers and two judges to count all ballots shall be elected for

the entire convention.

7. A Committee on Platform, which shall consist of nine members shall be elected by the convention.

8. A Committee on Resolutions shall be elected to consist of nine members.

9. A Committee on Constitution shall be elected to consist of nine members.

10. A Committee on Women and Their Relationship to the Socialist Party shall be elected, to consist of nine members.

11. A Press Committee shall be elected, to consist of five members.

12. An Auditing Committee of five members shall be elected.

13. A Committee on Ways and Means shall be elected to consist of nine members.

14. A Committee on General Program shall be elected to consist of nine members.

15. A Committee on Farmers' Program shall be elected to consist of seven members.

16. A Committee on Immigration shall be elected to consist of five members.

17. A Committee on the Relation of Foreign Speaking Organizations shall be elected to consist of five members.

18. Discussions shall be limited to ten minutes for each speaker. No speaker shall speak a second time until all desiring to use their time shall have had an opportunity to speak.

19. The sessions of the convention shall begin at 9:30 a. m. and continue to 12 noon, and from 1:30 p. m. to 6 p. m., and night sessions shall be held from 7:30 to 9:30 p. m. only when such sessions shall be provided for by motion during the day's proceedings.

20. Roberts' Rules of Order shall be used, with the exception that when the previous question has been called for two delegates on each side of the question shall be allowed three minutes each for closing the debate before the question is put.

21. During the sessions of the convention no smoking shall be allowed on the floor of the convention.

22. Each delegation shall select one of its members to announce its votes.

23. Each state delegation, in the

absence of any regular delegates shall designate the alternate who shall fill such vacancy.

24. The National Secretary shall have a voice, but no vote.

25. In case of a contest, the delegates, both contesting and contested, shall not vote upon such contest.

26. The election of International Delegate.

27. A committee of seven on the Nebraska situation shall be selected.

28. The nomination of President and Vice-President shall be by at least a two-thirds vote of the delegates present.

DEL. STEDMAN: The order of business follows, but I do not think it is essential that it should be read at the present time, as your order of business will change depending upon modifications of the rules. For instance, you might eliminate some or add some others. Just to that extent the order of business will naturally be modified, so that the report proper is before the convention. We will now take it up if you wish and read it verbatim.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will bear in mind, comrades, if you have any objection to any section read, please state your objection, otherwise it will be considered as approved.

The report was then taken up and considered section by section. The first section was read as follows:

1. A chairman shall be elected at the commencement of each day's session.

Adopted.

Section 2 was read, as follows:

2. A permanent secretary and two assistants shall be elected for the entire convention and may be selected outside from the body of delegates.

Adopted.

Section 3 was read, as follows:

3. The secretary may select one or more reading clerks to assist him.

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection. It is adopted.

Section 4 was read as follows:

4. A sergeant-at-arms and assistants shall be appointed by the chairman at the first session, such sergeant-at-arms and assistants to act throughout the entire convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? DEL. KILLINGBECK (N. J.): Does this also make it possible that

we can elect a sergeant-at-arms outside of the delegates?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I would so interpret it.

DEL. STEDMAN: I will include that if you wish.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I would say that I object. We can go down to the police headquarters and get a sergeant-at-arms.

DEL. STEDMAN: I will read this with the suggestion embodied: "A sergeant-at-arms and assistants shall be appointed by the chairman at the first session, such sergeant-at-arms and assistants to act throughout the entire convention, who may be selected from outside the delegates."

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection? If not, we will consider it adopted.

The next section was read as follows:

5. The sergeant-at-arms shall appoint five pages and five messengers, who may be appointed from those outside of the convention, and who shall act under his supervision.

Amended so as to strike out "five pages" and make it ten messengers. Adopted as amended.

The next section was read, as follows:

6. Four tellers and two judges to count all ballots shall be elected for the entire convention.

Adopted.

The next section was then read:

7. A Committee on Platform, which shall consist of nine members, shall be elected by the convention.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): I move an amendment providing that not more than one of these committee men shall be from the same state on each committee. (Seconded.) And if in order and to save further time I would like to make this apply to all these committees, so as to save the time of taking it up with each committee.

Carried. Section adopted as amended.

DEL. STEDMAN: I have it now as changed: "A Committee on Platform, which shall consist of nine members, shall be elected by the convention. Not more than one member shall be elected from any one state delegation." Strike out the word "one," so as to read "from any state delegation."

The next section was read:

8. A Committee on Platform shall be elected, to consist of nine members; not more than one member shall be from any state delegation.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move that the platforms submitted by the Platform Committee of the National Committee be referred to this Committee on Platform.

Carried.

DEL. BERYN (Ill.): I move that the present platform of the party be also referred to the committee. (Seconded.)

Section adopted.

The next section was read:

8. A Committee on Resolutions shall be elected, to consist of nine members; not more than one member from any state delegation shall serve.

Adopted.

Section 9 was next read as follows: 9. A Committee on Constitution shall be elected, to consist of nine members, only one to serve from any state.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

10. A Committee on Women and Their Relationship to the Socialist Party shall be elected, to consist of nine members.

Adopted.

The next section was read as follows:

11. A Press Committee shall be elected to consist of five members.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

12. An Auditing Committee of five members shall be elected.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

13. A Committee on Ways and Means shall be elected to consist of nine members.

Adopted.

The next section was read:

14. A Committee on General Program shall be elected, to consist of nine members.

DEL. STEDMAN: You will remember there was a Program Committee at the last convention, and Comrade Simons suggested it might be revised. That program was published and submitted to the last convention and referred for editing to the National Committee, and on that

committee was Comrade Simons, to edit the program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us understand, comrade. I would like first to have the committee explain what is meant. That a few of the immediate demands contained in the national platform can be taken out and embodied in this general program?

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): The way I look upon this is this: We got this up four years ago, and we are apparently going to do it here. It shows our prosperity. This program here is simply going to be like a bill of fare; just according to the appetite in the various localities they will select what particular thing they want out of it. That is about the size of it. We wrangled here four years ago on that thing, and I don't believe it was hardly of any use. The comrades in the different places are doing very well. They respond; they are learning from time to time to respond to the conditions. And this is too much to endorse, and it does not work anyhow. I think that entire proposition is a waste of energy. Our Committee on Platform and Committee on Resolutions will attempt to treat of national affairs, and we are going to have state autonomy, and perhaps a little stronger than before; and the comrades in the different states, when we present this, they won't allow themselves to be dictated to except by the limitations of our general principles in the platform as already laid down. Don't let down too many bars and make them jump too many hurdles. I believe in striking this whole thing out.

DEL. STEDMAN: Make a motion, then.

DEL. BERLYN: I make a motion to strike your whole program out.

Seconded by Lee and Simons. THE CHAIRMAN: A motion is made and seconded not to concur with the recommendation. Any further discussion?

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): Comrade chairman and delegates, it appears to me from the limited discussion that has ensued on this proposition and the fight that was made in Indianapolis in 1901 and the fight that was made in this hall four years ago, that if a program including all that is political party can ask for, and that is national legislation, state legislation

and municipal legislation, shall be stricken out, we shall have the fight all over again. In other words, it seems that the fight for immediate demands is still on. We ought to have a program, and that program ought to include all legislative measures that the political party can possibly have in the nation, state, city, village or town. (Applause.) I therefore ask that the delegates vote that this committee stand, and that when the program is recommended it include everything that we fight for and not a part.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): Comrade chairman, in seconding the motion to strike out this general program I did not at all have in mind the doing away with any of what we call immediate demands, or a working program for the party. I took it that the party has reached that state in this country that it is to have and that everybody knows that it is to have a working program of immediate demands, to fight for (applause), in its national campaigns and in each of its city campaigns. But it seems to me—and it was with this in view that I seconded the motion of Comrade Berlyn—it seems to me it is impracticable, especially in view of the experience that we have met, that it is impracticable for a national convention to make municipal campaigns for the various municipal programs that are to be held. (Applause.) It seems to me it is impracticable even for a national convention to make state programs for the various state campaigns that are to be held. And as for our national campaign, I am of the opinion that we certainly should have a national program, and I am of the opinion that it should be—I do not say actually in one piece with the platform; it may very properly be made a program of demands appended to the platform, the platform being a declaration of principles; but even then, so separated as it should be, yet the whole must be a harmonious piece of work, and it should be the work of one committee, the Platform Committee, and for that reason I seconded the motion.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I am in favor of the recommendation of the committee. It is true that we have ar-

rived at the place where we have a state and municipal program, and there is no better place for those ideas to be put forth than in this national convention so that we people, fighting the battles down in the cities and in the counties, can say to them, "We have a program, starting from the nation and going down to the city." (Applause.) Now, our first fight will not be at Washington City; it will not be at the state capitals in the states; but it will be in our small towns and in our cities, and we want a program so that we can say to our friends, "Here is what we propose to do." I am in favor of what the committee has recommended.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I also seconded the motion of Comrade Berlyn, and I rise to speak in favor of striking out this committee. I do not think I can be accused of being in opposition to the formation of such a program. I was the man who made the original motion seven or eight years ago in the city of Indianapolis. I was the man who put on that program several months of very hard work, and who did more perhaps than any other one man, with the exception of Comrade Untermann, to get the program we have in actual form. I thoroughly believe we need to have something to say wherever we go in to action, be it in the smallest village or be it in the nation, on whatsoever problems are up for consideration where working-class interests are at stake. But, recognizing that fact, I also recognize from experience and the hard work I put in on the national program, the absolutely impossibility of this National Convention, in a discussion participated in by two hundred delegates, outlining anything that would be of any possible benefit to a village in one place and a great city in another; to a mining community in the Gogebic iron country and a farming community in New England and the great city of Chicago. (Applause.) And because I recognize the impossibility of hammering out properly the details that are necessary, I believe we ought not again to attempt that thing. I found it myself impossible. I relinquished it and other men took it up, and they found it impossible,

and I do not believe we ought to tackle that again in this convention.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I am decidedly in favor of a working program. I am convinced that the time has passed when even the national convention can seriously oppose any working program or immediate demands. At the same time I hold that our national convention cannot prescribe municipal and state programs for every municipality and state in the country. It can only reach the nation. We make our national program, and it ought to be satisfactory. Then leave it to the various states and municipalities to draw up their own programs in conformity with it and to meet their various local needs.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): It is unnecessary for me to state where I stand on the question of immediate demands, and I am not going to make a long speech. We of course must have a program, particularly so in my part of the country where we take part in legislative work of the state; and particularly so in my home city which we may control next year or in two years. But for that very reason we do not want a committee on program. You in Seattle do not know about the needs of Milwaukee. We in Milwaukee do not want to interfere in the affairs of New York. I hope they have as bright men in New York as I am, and I know we have as bright men in Milwaukee as they have in New York. We must have a national platform, and it is our duty at this convention here to construct a national platform, a platform that will contain our national demands. We are here for that purpose. Wherever we have a state convention in any state we will formulate our state demands. At the local convention we will formulate our local demands. They all have to be in the same spirit, the same general socialistic spirit, which is international, but there we stop. I am in favor of striking out the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the motion to strike out the paragraph read by the chairman of the committee on rules, say aye; opposed no. The ayes have it.

The next section was read: "16. A Committee on Farmers'

Program to be elected, to consist of seven members."

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move that we do not concur in the report.

Motion seconded.

DEL. ATWOOD (So. Dak.): In the eastern half of South Dakota, in the Red River Valley and in Kansas where I have been I have seen things that have made me think it is pretty near time that these Socialist mathematicians had figured out where they come in contact with the farmer, and figured it so that the farmer comes in to the socialist movement as a class-conscious workingman. Today our western farmer has nothing. He is skinned by the capitalist class, and staggers under the same burdens as the other workmen. The farmer's place is in the Socialist Party, and we will never get South Dakota until we get the farmer into the Socialist movement.

A DELEGATE: It is evident to my mind that all of us thoroughly understand that the farmer's place is in the socialist movement, just as the place of the workingman everywhere is in the Socialist Party. It is evident to my mind that when we issue an appeal to the workmen in our national platform we include among them the farmer. I believe that the farmer understands it thoroughly, and if he does not, it is time he was waking up along those lines. To make a direct appeal to the miner or the printer or any other line of industry seems to me superfluous.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): I want to see this committee stand. I have given considerable time to farm territory, and while it is true that it might seem superfluous for us to make a special appeal the wage-earner, whether he be printer, mechanic or blacksmith, it is different in the case of the farmer, a large class of whom are land owners today. These are called capitalists by a number of men now in the socialist movement, but we are coming to recognize them as wage slaves. I think there is plenty of work to be done by the special committee on the farmer. Let them report to this convention, and if we see fit to incorporate their reports in the report of the committee on platform, well and good. If we don't

want to take up their work, it won't take us long to put it away. I want to see this committee on the farmer get to work and see what they can bring into this proletarian convention.

DEL. FREEMAN (Ala.): I have been a farmer all the years of my life, a member of all the farmers' organizations in the South and now a member of the Farmers' Union, and I speak a great deal in my part of the country to farmers. Yet I come to you opposing the platform. As a convention of socialists here, representing the wage-earners of the world, the proletarian class, it is absolutely impossible for you to make a program that will fit the proletarian and fit the farmer. If I were put on that committee I would be at an absolute loss how to begin. How much more would this be true if you put on this committee men who never worked on a farm in their lives. I think I am in a position to thoroughly digest the matter, and I hope the proposed committee will not be elected.

DEL. RHODES (Texas): My Friends—I have belonged to the Farmers' Alliance, the Knights of Labor, the Agricultural Wheel, and the Farmers' Union. I have been identified with every labor movement we have had in Texas. The only trouble about this farmer proposition is that we have got two classes of farmers—one class that farms the soil and another class that farms him. Their interests, of course, are opposed. The class that farms the farmer—if you give him the prestige, sooner or later your whole movement will go to pieces. Now, to the point. I was making a speech the other day in Bonham, Texas. I had a delegation nearly half as many as you have in this house, and nearly every person in the house agreed with me in the proposition of collective ownership, but one man. He came to me afterwards and said: "I have been with you for years. I know no man whom I appreciate more than I do you. I am sorry to see you leaving us (meaning the Populists). Now, I endorse every single plank you have got in the socialist platform save and except one, and that is the LAND plank." He could not agree with us on that plank, because he owned more

land in that town than any other man. He was perfectly willing to socialize everything else, if he were left untouched. The land proposition is a very critical thing for these people, and when you go out, without trying to discriminate between those two classes of farmers, you make a mistake. I take the position that every socialist who understands the position takes, that the farmer is the man who puts his hand to the plow, and not the man who farms the farmer. You will find one group of people who will say, "We endorse all the planks of your platform, if you will just leave out the railroads." Another group will say, "We will accept all your platform, if you will just leave out the docks," and another group will want the mines left out, and so on, until every plank of the platform is gone. We can't reach these people in that way. This movement is a workingman's movement, a proletarian movement, and I believe we should make our propaganda to the working people of this country, and forget that a man is a mechanic or a farmer or a stone-cutter or what he is.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I am not a farmer, but I belong to a trades union. I am a proletarian. The average farmer is not a proletarian. Yet he is a producer. I belong to the working class movement—it is a movement that wants to win, a movement that wants to get control of this country. Now, I tell you, comrades, that you will never get control of the United States unless you have the farming class with you. The farmers do not even need to fight. If the farmers refuse to bring produce to the City of Chicago for six weeks, no matter whether we have control of Chicago or not, we are gone up. If the farmers of the country surrounding Milwaukee refuse to bring supplies to the city of Milwaukee for three weeks, no matter whether we control the city or not, by force of arms or any other way, we lose. We must get the farmers as a class. I have listened carefully to the delegate from Texas. With him I believe that we must get into very close touch with the farmers. Ours is a class movement, but it is built upon a

materialistic basis. We must deal with the farmer on that basis. In order to get the farmer you must give him something real. You must show him in what way the Socialist Party, in what way socialism, will benefit the farmer. If you cannot show him that socialism is going to benefit the farmer, the farmer has a right to stay away. Anybody who tells you that the proletariat of the city form the majority of the population of our country is mistaken. He has never studied the census. Now, comrades, this is a very great and grave question. We are not the only country that is discussing this. The farmer question has been discussed and agitated in Germany for the last sixteen years. They have had at the German congresses similar discussions to those at our conventions. They have had committees of very bright men. Some of the brightest socialists of the world have taken up this question. They have written many books on it, and they have not solved the question yet. They have tried to solve the question in France, by a guaranty to the small farmer that he would keep his land. I say this is a great question, which has been discussed all over the world, and which we must also discuss. And we more so than any other country because this country is before all things a farmers' country. Now, let us elect a committee. You don't have to adopt what the committee brings before you. You can listen to the report of the committee and if it doesn't suit you, you can reject it. But let us have a discussion. It isn't going to hurt us. We can learn something, at least.

DEL. EDWARDS (Okla.): I want to say to you that I live in one of the great farming states of the Union, in Oklahoma. Oklahoma is today one of the farthest advanced states in socialism. Out there the farmers are not asking for any special demands. I was speaking recently among the farmers in Missouri, and they are not asking for any special demands. What they need is to have the gospel spread before them. The principles and the program of socialism are enough for the farmers who are willing to investigate it, and I don't think they need anything special.

DEL. BARZEE (Oregon): I want to say to you, to begin with, that I am a farmer, but at the same time I want to speak from the proletarian standpoint. In my mind the question resolves itself into this: Is this a proletarian, workingman's movement or is it a populist middle-class movement? I say if the socialistic program is not good enough for the farmer, let him stand where he is till the capitalist gets him, boots and breeches.

DEL. BLOCK (Okla.): I am from Oklahoma, but lately from South Dakota, and I know a good deal about farming. I don't think we need make any special provision for the farmer more than anybody else, but I think there is a difference between the farmer and the regular ordinary wage-worker. He gets the same sauce served to him, but then he thinks he owns something. Now, we are not very definite as to what provision shall be made and what shall be done with the land that he owns, and what shall become of his team that he thinks he has got. I think it would be a very good idea to have a committee. We don't need to accept what they bring in if we don't like it. But I think we ought to make our position a little more clear upon this land question for the benefit of the farmer. We need him. And we know we have to make it clear to him that he is not going to be deprived of the little home he owns.

The previous question was called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the previous question being put, please say aye; contrary, no. The ayes have it. The vote comes upon the motion that we do not concur in the recommendation of the committee to elect a committee on Farmers' program, on the farming question. All those in favor of the motion please say aye; opposed, no. The ayes seem to have it.

A division was called for, and a vote was taken by show of hands.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those who will raise their hands now will be in favor of not electing a committee on the farmers' program. All those in favor of striking out that clause, please raise their right hands. All those opposed to the motion to strike

out—all those in favor of the Farmers' Program Committee—

Objection was made to that statement of the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair has been corrected, and has corrected itself. All those in favor of the election of such a committee raise your right hands.

The vote stood 101 for striking out; 81 for the election of the Committee. The motion to strike out was declared carried.

Credentials Committee.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): presented the following report:

Your Committee on Credentials met, with the following comrades present: Rellly, New Jersey; Untermann, Idaho; Clark, Texas; Berlyn, Illinois; Graham, Montana; Tuck, California; Solomon, New York; Boomer, Washington; and Gaylord, Wisconsin.

Clark of Texas was elected chairman, and Solomon secretary.

The Committee took up first the uncontested delegates, and ask to report as follows:

ALABAMA—Entitled to two delegates; credentials have been received for Thos. N. Freeman and F. X. Waldhorst.

ARKANSAS—Six delegates; credentials for Dan Hogan, E. W. Perrin, Wm. Penrose, J. Sam. Jones, Wells Le Ferre and W. R. Snow.

ARIZONA—Two delegates; credentials received for Joseph D. Cannon and J. M. Morrison.

CALIFORNIA—Twelve delegates; credentials received for Wm. McDewitt, F. I. Wheat, G. W. Woodby, H. C. Tuck, Josephine R. Cole,

Mary F. Merrill, J. B. Osborne, Cloudsley Johns, Harry M. McKee, Kasper Bauer, Bertha W. Starkweather; also an alternate in place of N. A. Richardson, who is unable to attend, the alternate is W. S. Bradford.

COLORADO—Four delegates; credentials received for T. L. Bate, Guy E. Miller, Milla Tupper Maynard, L. E. Floeten.

CONNECTICUT—Two delegates; credentials received from William Schiedge, Alfred W. Smith.

FLORIDA—One delegate, A. J. Pettigrew.

IDAHO—Three delegates; credentials received from Ernest Untertramm, E. L. Riigg, John Chenoweth.

ILLINOIS—Fourteen delegates; credentials received from J. O. Bentall, Barney Berlyn, James H. Brower, John Collins, G. T. Fraenkel, Gertrude B. Hunt, S. A. Knophagel, A. M. Lewis, Thos. J. Morgan, May Wood Simons, A. M. Simons, Seymour Stedman, John Walker; also from Comrade Charles H. Kerr, who is alternate for and has been seated instead of J. M. Patterson, who is in Europe.

INDIANA—Four delegates; credentials received from S. M. Reynolds, Robert Dunbar, and in place of Comrades Debs and Hallenberger the two alternates, F. G. Strickland and Otto Kunath have been seated temporarily until the regular delegates have arrived.

IOWA—Five delegates; credentials received from John E. Shank, Edward J. Rohrer, Margaret M. Brown, John M. Work, W. C. Hills.

KANSAS—Five delegates; credentials received from Benjamin F. Wilson, J. E. Snyder, A. S. McAllister, Ludwig E. Katterfeld, and Grace D. Brewer, as alternate, is seated in place of H. Rogers.

KENTUCKY—One delegate, Frank E. Seeds.

LOUISIANA—One delegate, Alexander Hynes.

MAINE—Two delegates; report has been received of the election of only one delegate, Willis E. Pelsey; there is no report about the other delegate.

MARYLAND—Two delegates; credentials received from H. Claude Lewis, William A. Toole.

MASSACHUSETTS—Ten delegates; credentials received from James F. Carey, Antoinette Konikow, Dan A. White, Eliot White, Patrick Mahoney, Squire E. Putney, George G. Cutting, Alva E. Fenton; alternates, in place of Franklin H. Wentworth, C. C. Hitchcock, and in place of Natti Latiala, Harriet D'Orsay.

MICHIGAN—Four delegates; Guy H. Lockwood, Etta Menton, Tom Hittunen; in place of A. M. Stirtton, who will not be present, the committee recommends the seating of Dr. McMaster.

MINNESOTA—Ten delegates; credentials received from L. D. Rose, Thomas J. Peach, M. Kaplan, J. G. Maatala, Elias Thorsett, Ester Nieminen, James S. Ingalls, Guy Williams, Jules J. Anderson, John Mack.

MISSOURI—Seven delegates; credentials received from William L. Garver, G. A. Hoehn, William M. Brandt, Leander G. Pope, E. T. Behrens, P. H. Gallery, Caleb Lipscomb.

MONTANA—Seven delegates; credentials received from James D. Graham, Ida Crouch Hazlett, Florence Wesleder, Geo. H. Ambrose, John Bannell, Arthur Harvey in place of Del. John Powers, unable to attend, and the first available alternate, James Powers, is seated in place of James Proctor who cannot attend.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—Two delegates; credentials received for William H. Wilkins, and in place of Del. McFall is seated his alternate, Louis Arnsien.

NEW JERSEY—Six delegates; credentials received for Geo. H. Goebel, H. R. Kearns, W. B. Killingbeck, Fred Krafft, G. H. Strobell, James M. Reilly.

NEW YORK—Nineteen delegates; credentials received from Joseph Wanhope, Morris Hillquist, Algenon Lee, Thos. J. Lewis, Henry L. Stobodin, Fred Paulitsch, Sol Fieldman, Robert Hunter, U. Solomon, Benjamin Hanford, Julius Getter, C. L. Furman, C. H. Vander Porter, John Spargo, W. E. Cole, Gustave Strelbel, W. F. Fuhrman, August Klenke, Mark Peiser; in place of a delegate who is unable to be present, the committee recommends the seating of his alternate, Peter V. Cargill.

NORTH DAKOTA—Two delegates; credentials received for Arthur Bassett, and A. S. Anderson.

OHIO—This state is entitled to nine delegates. We have received report about the election of only seven delegates. The delegates reported on are Marguerite Prevey, Isaac Cowan, Robert Bandlow, Fred F. Vautrim, Ellis O. Jones, E. L. Rodgers, E. J. Zeigler. In place of Del. Rodgers, who cannot attend, his alternate, D. P. Farrell, is present, and is recommended to be seated.

OKLAHOMA—Twelve delegates; credentials received for John Hagel,

O. F. Branstetter, C. C. Ross, G. W. Davis, Winnie E. Branstetter, L. S. Edwards, C. H. Dome, Carrie C. Block, W. B. Reynolds, C. B. Boylan, J. G. Wills, Frank P. O'Hare.

OREGON—Five delegates; credentials received for F. C. Varner, R. Ryan, C. W. Barzee, Mrs. Mollie Crabree, and B. F. Ramp.

PENNSYLVANIA—Thirteen delegates; credentials received from William Adams, Sam Clark, Joseph E. Cohen, George N. Cohen, Edwin H. Davies, Con F. Foley, Louis Gazoni, James H. Maurer, Edward Moore, Robert B. Ringler, John W. Slayton, Fred L. Schwartz, F. L. Tobias.

RHODE ISLAND—One delegate, Fred Hurst.

SOUTH DAKOTA—Credentials received for E. Francis Atwood, Freeman Knowles.

TENNESSEE—One delegate, Dr. Joseph F. Voss.

TEXAS—Nine delegates; credentials received from H. L. Holman, Alice McFadin, W. J. Bell, Stanley J. Clark, M. A. Smith, W. W. Buchanan, J. C. Rhodes, J. C. Thompson, Laura B. Payne.

UTAH—Two delegates; credentials received from Grant Syphers and Robert Leggett.

VERMONT—One delegate, Lawrence Albert Wilson.

WEST VIRGINIA—One delegate, H. W. Houston.

(We have received no report in regard to Houston, but National Secretary Barnes reports that he has been elected and we therefore recommend his seating, pending the arrival of his credentials.)

WYOMING—Three delegates; only two have been reported to us, H. V. Grosbeck and W. L. O'Neill.

MISSISSIPPI—One delegates. We have received no report and no credentials.

DELAWARE—One delegate, Frank A. Henck.

GEORGIA—One delegate, Max Wile.

NEW MEXICO—One delegate, W. P. Metcalf.

NEVADA—One delegate, A. Grant Miller.

NORTH CAROLINA—One delegate, J. J. Quantz.

VIRGINIA—A. H. Dennett.

These are the uncontested delegates.

Now there are other delegations. Now there are other delegations to be reported by this committee, with their recommendation, which cannot really be classified as contested delegations, because the committee considered the contest of such trivial nature as not to be entertained at all, but we have decided to include them in a separate report. The contest which I refer to is a contest signed by three comrades in the state of Nebraska, contesting the seats of Comrades Berger, Thompson and John M. Work on the ground that they are defendants on a charge which they are going to make at this convention for gross violation of the National Constitution. The committee was of the opinion that this is a matter which belongs to the states themselves, and did not entertain the contests at all, and recommends that the comrades mentioned be seated in this convention.

WISCONSIN—Ten delegates; credentials received for Winfield R. Gaylord, Frank J. Weber, E. H. Thomas, E. T. Melms, Victor L. Berger, W. A. Jacobs, Carl D. Thompson, Emil Seidel, Frederic Heath and Charles Sandburg.

The seats of Comrades Berger and Thompson were the only ones contested—the others were not contested—but the committee recommends that the entire delegation be seated.

The committee further desires to report that the seat of the delegate from Nebraska, G. C. Porter, has been contested, but the committee has decided to recommend the seating of the delegate pending the further investigation into the merits of the case.

The next case was the state of Washington. There has been correspondence filed with the national secretary from the provisional committee of the Socialist Party of the State of Washington. The committee did not go into the merits of the controversy, but recommends for the present the temporary seating of the delegates from the State of Washington, as follows: Emil Herman, Richard and Krueger, John Downie, Alfred Wagenknecht, George E. Boomer, and E. J. Brown.

A protest has also been filed by J. B. Osborne of California against the seating of William McDewitt of California. The grounds of the protest

were a certain violation of Article 2, Section 2, of the National Constitution. The committee was of the opinion that the matter properly belonged to the State of California and has no place in the National Convention, and recommends that Comrade McDewitt be seated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, comrades, you have heard, or ought to have heard, the report of the Committee on Credentials. It may be divided into three parts, the larger number being those uncontested, and among those I include the delegates from Wisconsin, because that is not a contest. Then there is a contest against Comrade McDewitt of California, which the committee recommends be overruled and the delegate seated. Then there are two delegations, the Nebraska and Washington delegations, with regard to which the committee is still considering the objections, and recommends that the delegations be seated temporarily. We will take up these three classes of credentials separately. What is your pleasure with those delegates whose seats are not contested? The recommendation is that they be seated?

DEL. INGALLS (Minn.): I move that the recommendation of the committee be concurred in. (Seconded.)

The recommendation was adopted. THE CHAIRMAN: With reference to Comrade McDewitt of California, the Credentials Committee recommends that he be seated in spite of the protest, on the ground that the protest against him is a matter that should properly come before the local organization and not the National Convention. What is your pleasure with this recommendation?

DEL. KRAFFT (N. J.): I move and the delegate seated. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): The question is, shall a delegate be seated that the recommendation be accepted who belongs to a local and supports that local in an open violation of the National Constitution of the Socialist Party, Article II, Section 2, of the constitution? I would say upon that subject, comrade chairman and comrades of the convention, that the matter would have been settled by the State of California were it not for the fact that this particular local—

THE CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, comrade, I will have to rule you out of order. We cannot possibly entertain objections or charges against members here. Where there are two conflicting applicants, their credentials are in the hands of the Credentials Committee, and they will have to take the same course as the others. We are not concerned with any possible charges against that delegate. We have no jurisdiction.

DEL. OSBORNE: I will offer a substitute motion to the one pending before the house: that after all of the contests are settled this convention take up the question of the one pending.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that out of order.

DEL. OSBORNE: I appeal from the decision of the chair, on the ground that this convention has a right and it is its duty to enforce the constitution of the Socialist Party. The appeal was put and the chair sustained.

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation of the committee is that Comrade McDewitt be seated. All in favor say aye; opposed, no. The ayes have it. And it is so ordered.

Now, in the case of Nebraska and Washington, protests have been made and are being considered by the Committee on Credentials, and the committee recommends that they be seated temporarily, pending the investigation of the objections. What is your pleasure?

Moved and seconded to concur in the recommendation of the committee. Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your convention is now organized, comrades, and the first order of business will be the election of a permanent chairman for the rest of the day. There cannot be any business before the convention except this.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I move that you the temporary chairman be made the permanent chairman for the day. (Seconded.)

Carried unanimously. DEL. HEATH (Wis.) was elected permanent secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business, before we proceed any further, will be to ratify the adop-

tion of so much of the proposed rules as we have before informally adopted. I will entertain a motion to that effect.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move that we adopt the action of the temporary organization in regard to rules, so far as we had proceeded. (Seconded.)

DEL. STEDMAN (Ill.): I move an amendment that the ratification be subject to that portion relating to the Farmers' Program. If this is seconded, I wish to speak on it. (Seconded.)

DEL. STEDMAN: I think that should be eliminated from this vote for the following reasons: So far as that proposition of the committee was discussed it was in more or less of a haphazard way. It is very true that one farmer vouched for the position of the farmers on the question in Oklahoma and another who knew just what the farmers wanted in Texas. The suggestion was made that we might drift into Populism. The danger from that, I take it, is hardly a considerable element.

We do, however, know this, that if a committee is appointed it might suggest no program—it might suggest a small one, or a considerable one. It might define or express the policy that this party might adopt to interest the farmers in the Socialist movement. With all due respect to the delegates from Oklahoma, with all due respect to those who are "up" on the farmers' needs and desires everywhere, I say that we have not at the present time the interest of the farmers as such in this movement.

I see no reason why we should discontinue that question in five or ten minutes' desultory talk. It is a question of considerable importance, not only to the Socialist movement of the United States, but of all other countries. If in other countries where the farmers are much less of a factor than they are here, they can devote days to the subject, we might find that it could benefit our movement to discuss it for at least half an hour. It cannot be disposed of by persons getting up and saying that they are farmers, and they know all about farming. It will do us no harm to discuss the question, especially where we recognize the importance of the subject to the movement, and especially when

electing a committee will not mean the adoption of any particular policy nor define our course of propaganda to the farmers. But it may assist in throwing some light upon the subject by and through which some of us who live in the cities may draw some information from those who live on the farms, and tell us why it is they were interested to such an extent that when it came to the question of nationalizing the grain elevators and docks they promoted and carried through a law, which law was, however, later declared unconstitutional. We do want a policy, a general policy, that will arrest their attention and consideration as farmers. There can be no harm in discussing the question and there may be considerable benefit to the movement, and not blindly shutting our eyes to a question that we may so easily be mistaken upon.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): I am opposed to the farmers' plank of this program but I am in favor of this committee. I think it is of practical value to our movement. Anybody who has gone down among the farmers and tried to make a Socialist convert, must realize the importance of the subject. You go and tell the farmers that you are going to employ all the unemployed, etc., and they will ask you, "What are we going to do when you employ all the unemployed?" I am in favor of the committee. While I am opposed, on my present knowledge, to a farmers' plank, I am in favor of a committee that can give us some information on this farmer question. Some of our speakers go out into the country and tell the people we are not a farmers' party, we are a wageworkers' party. The farmer is not a wageworker. He is a property owner. He is a small capitalist. Another group of organizers go down into the country and they say: "You farmers are producers, you are capitalists." Now, I say that if we want to make an appeal to the farmer vote we want to know what we are going to say to the farmers, and why we say it. If we haven't anything to say to the farmers, then it is a waste of energy to send organizers down into those districts. If we haven't anything to say to the farmers, then let us give all our

energies to the cities. What are the facts about this farmer question? We do not know the facts. And that is why I am in favor of this committee.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): I speak both as a farmer and a Socialist agitator. I am in favor of a committee. I would be in favor of that committee being composed exclusively of farmers, meeting and conferring among themselves as to what matter they should bring before this convention, and then this convention should accept or reject their proposal.

Every day that I speak before the farmers, some farmer asks me to show him our platform and where it hits him; and there is not a solitary place in the platform, with the exception of that sentence where we propose a graduated land tax, that I can show him so as to help him to grasp our philosophy.

I am not in favor of any middle class proposals in our platform. I want, and all the Socialist farmers of Oklahoma want, revolution, and we want to have our Socialist farmers get together and pronounce "revolution" so the other farmers will know what they are talking about. Therefore, I hope the comrades will appoint this committee, bringing into it the brains from the ranks of the farmers who are Socialists, that they may bring before this convention a proposal that will express the requirements of the farmers.

DEL. SEIDEL (Wis.): The real question before this convention is whether we are going to elect a committee who shall study into this question of our relations to the farmer. I don't care whether you stand for or against the revolution. Those who are for the revolution ought first to be able to revolutionize their own minds. If you cannot offer the farmer anything it shows that you do not know how to handle the proposition. If I as a business man employ a traveling salesman and give him a good piece of goods to sell and he cannot sell it, he does not know his business. And I say if a man has a piece of goods like Socialism to offer to the people, and cannot make them adopt it, he does not understand his business, he doesn't know how to offer it to them. I want to say that there are many problems up before us today as a nation.

The question is whether the Socialists of America or the United States, assembled in convention here, can take them up and handle them. As far as the farmers are concerned, I want to say that I know that hundreds of them are raising fruit that is allowed to rot because they cannot find a market for it, and I know that hundreds of workmen in the cities are hungry for fruit and cannot get it. And the Socialists of the country in convention assembled say, "We have nothing to say in this matter." What do you think of that? You farmers perhaps have plenty of fruit in Oklahoma and Texas. We in Milwaukee haven't got it. Let us discuss this question. If you don't want to dispose of it today, or at this convention, you have at least shown that you have the courage to face it. Don't let us say, "Oh, I am too class-conscious to do it." I want to tell you, if you are phlegmatic you may easily be class-conscious; but if you want to be a real active militant Socialist and do something, then you have got to get down to hard work, and that is the secret of success in some of our cities. Amendment carried. Original motion, as amended, carried.

DEL. SOLOMON: The Credential Committee makes a supplemental report to the effect that two fraternal delegates have presented credentials in behalf of the Socialist Party of Canada, the names of the fraternal delegates being A. W. Mance and E. A. Drury. The committee recommends that we seat the comrades as fraternal delegates on the platform, with a voice but not a vote.

Motion made and seconded that the report of the committee be adopted. Carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further, to have the matter clear I will say that I will construe your former vote on the Stedman amendment to mean that a committee on a farmers program is to be elected. If I am wrong in my construction, please say so.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I object to the construction of the chair, and raise a point of order against such a ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those who are in favor of the construction given

by the chair to the previous vote, please say aye; contrary minded, no. The ayes have it. It is so ordered.

DEL. STEDMAN (reading report of Committee on Rules): No. 17: A Committee on Immigration shall be elected, to consist of five members. DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I wish to move that that be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I rise to oppose the election of a Committee on Immigration, and I will state my reasons very briefly. I don't see how this body, in electing a committee on immigration, would be likely to select the comrades who could contribute any special light on the subject. I would call the attention of the delegates to the fact that anybody who has anything to say, any light to contribute on the subject of immigration, will be able to have a hearing before the Resolutions Committee, will be able to submit any resolution to that committee, and it will come up in the convention properly. Therefore it seems to me a waste of time to elect a committee on the immigration question.

Motion carried.

The next section was read:

"No. 18: A committee on the relation of foreign-speaking organizations shall be elected, to consist of five members."

Adopted.

The next section was read:

"No. 19. Discussion shall be limited to ten minutes for each speaker; no speaker shall speak a second time, until all who are desirous of using their time have spoken."

Adopted.

The next section was read:

"No. 20. Sessions of the convention shall begin at 9:30 a. m. and continue until 12 o'clock, and then from 1:30 p. m. to 6 p. m. Night sessions shall be held from 7:30 to 9:30, only when such sessions shall be provided for by motion during the day's proceedings." Amended, fixing the hour from 10 to 12:30 and from 2 to 6. Adopted as amended.

The next section was read:

"No. 21. Roberts' Rules of Order shall be used, with the exception that when the previous question shall have been called for, two delegates on each side of the question shall be allowed

three minutes each for closing the debate before the question is put."

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I would amend it to read that the closer shall have five minutes, instead of three.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move to amend the section by adding "And with the further exception that no motion or proposition shall require more than a majority vote."

Both amendments carried. Section adopted as amended.

TELEGRAMS.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a few telegrams which will take but a few minutes to read:

"Baltimore, Md., May 10, 1908.

Socialist Convention,

Brand's Hall, Chicago, Ill.

May the result of the convention prove a beacon light for workingmen's emancipation.

Relief Society for Victims of Russian Revolution.

"Paterson, N. J., May 10, 1908.

Greetings from Local Passaic County. Wishing success in the great work for liberty."

"Philadelphia, Pa.

National Convention of the Workmen's Circle, 15,000 members, sends fraternal greetings to the National Convention of the Socialist Party. The people want Socialism, and they will have it."

"New York, N. Y.

The Jewish Daily Vorwaerts sends hearty congratulations to the National Convention of the Socialist Party. The country is rallying 'round our banners. The mountain tops are reddening with the golden glow of the gathering dawn. May your deliberations mark a great red-letter year in the history of the American people.

Abram Carhart,
Editor Jewish Daily Vorwaerts."

"New Jersey State Committee sends fraternal greetings. Keep cool and get there."

"Newark, N. J.
Greetings. Our choice—Debs and Haywood."

The convention then adjourned to Monday, May 11, 1908, at 10 a. m.

SECOND DAY'S SESSION

National Secretary Barnes called the convention to order at 10 o'clock a. m. and asked for nominations for chairman for the day.

Del. Carey, of Massachusetts, was elected.

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): I have a question of personal privilege and urgency. I have a communication to offer, and I desire to move its adoption.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the chair will recognize it. Del. Miller read the following telegram:

"Ernest Mills, Secretary Western Federation of Miners, 605 Railroad Building, Denver, Colorado: The Socialist Party in convention assembled sends greetings to the Western Federation of Miners. We congratulate you upon the splendid battle and final vindication of your organization. We condemn with you the use of Federal troops to destroy a labor organization as in Alaska. We are with you not only until Adams and the last of the victims of the acts of the Pinkertons are liberated, but until all the toilers walk out from the prison pens of poverty into the sunlight of economic freedom."

DEL. MILLER: I desire to move the sending of this telegram.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): A point of information. I desire to know whether the Western Federation of Miners are in session now, or whether there is any particular urgency for this resolution or telegram.

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): I would just like to say that the Western Federation of Miners are not in session.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Now that I had my information, I move that this telegram and all other resolutions coming before this convention be referred to the Committee on Resolutions. (Seconded.) I do not believe

in offering resolutions out of the order as emergency measures and passing things without due and proper deliberation.

DEL. MILLER: I did not expect any opposition to this resolution. It seems to me this is a question of expediency, and the fact of the battle that the Federation is waging at the present time fully justifies the presentation of these resolutions as a special order of business. Perhaps you do not realize the blows that the Western Federation of Miners are meeting at the present time, the schemes that have been carried out against it. You are all acquainted with the dynamite firing up there at Telluride, and some of you people who may have used dynamite know that in their hands, in the way it is said to have been used out there in Telluride, it is manipulated by a mine manager. (Applause.) I would have the Socialist Party continue as it has been doing, throw down the gage of battle to those who are fighting the working class. It seems to me the urgency or the need of this is the effect upon the public mind that the action of this convention will have. (Applause.) I desire that we have the benefit of that. I did not suppose that there would be quite as many lukewarm friends of the Western Federation of Miners as I have found. That is all. I wish simply to say that I would like to see this resolution passed. Have you so completely forgotten the fact that the Western Federation of Miners has furnished you the best propaganda material that the Socialist Party has ever had? (Applause.) Do you realize the fact that an organization cannot hold the public stage for four years without putting into that propaganda the heart and the life of its members? Do you realize that that struggle has not yet

passed, simply because the men who are at the head of the organization were acquitted out there in Idaho? I want to say to you people that the eyes of the entire country were focused on Boise when Haywood was before the court. I am afraid that some times there is a little bit too much hero worship in the Socialist Party of this country. (Applause.) I was glad that you had your eyes on that case, but I don't want you to take them off the tragedy occurring in the Rocky Mountains now because the man who stands at the bar of the court happens to be a private in the great army of organized labor instead of one of the division commanders. (Applause.) I want you people to recognize the fact that the trial of Steve Adams is just as crucial, so far as the fate and fortunes of the Western Federation of Miners were concerned as they were when Haywood was on trial. (Applause.) I want you to recognize the fact that the Socialist Party may again have a battle, may again raise a cry for help, when all the voices of the cohorts of capitalism shall be silenced and an innocent member of the working class walk out to freedom and labor be again vindicated. (Applause.)

DEL. HILLQUITT (N. Y.): Comrades, just one minute. I want to appeal to the sobriety of this convention. I think I by no means feel less strongly on the subject brought up by Comrade Miller than Comrade Miller himself. I fully agree with every statement made by him, and am heartily in favor of the resolution, but I want to have some order and some system if we are to do business. We have plenty of points, comrades, which are of urgency. If every comrade will get up out of order, offer a resolution and make an agitation speech, we will not do the business for which we have come here. (Applause.) I claim we have a Committee on Resolutions which will go over all the resolutions offered, consider them and report them with its recommendations, and the floor will then be open for full discussion. Otherwise one will get up with an open letter to Theodore Roosevelt, another with a telegram of congratulation, and we will have nothing but interruptions day after day,

hour after hour. Let us do business in a business-like way. (Applause.)

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Comrade Chairman, the Western Federation of Miners are not in convention at the present time, but I want to inform the delegates that the Western Federation of Miners are out on strike in Alaska and the Federal troops are in Alaska at the present time, and I believe this is a case of urgency, and for that reason I will support the resolution. I am in favor of voting on that matter now, and I do not believe that we should play politician here at this time on such an important matter.

The previous question was ordered. DEL. BAUER (Cal.): I rise to speak against the motion. I wish to say this to the delegates present: every time a matter has been brought up some one gets up and moves to refer it somewhere. Now, if we had taken a vote and acted upon the matter this thing would not have happened and taken up the last thirty minutes. It is the referring that causes all this trouble. Now, I say this is a matter of urgency and it would not take more than five minutes to dispose of it, but now those who indulge in the parliamentary tactics cause all this trouble.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I speak for the motion. It is not a question whether this resolution should be adopted or not. It is a question whether we shall conform to the rules. I believe there is not a delegate in this hall but what is in favor of the adoption of that resolution, but we are here to do business and we are going to have a Resolutions Committee, and this matter is no more urgent than a great many other matters which are to come before this convention and will come before this convention. It is no more urgent than the resolution on trades unionism or other resolutions that will be presented, and I believe that in order to expedite matters we had better refer all these propositions to their regular committees so that we can do business in an orderly method and get through some time this summer.

DEL. BRANDT (Mo.): I am against the motion for one particular reason at least, that I have heard not less than three different speakers on this floor say they are in favor of it,

but they want to refer it, and if they are in favor of it let us vote right now and dispose of it and see if they are in favor.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I am in favor of the motion to refer to the committee, because I do not believe that any delegate from one reading of that telegram will know whether or not that is the most serviceable, the best and most effective kind of telegram that can be sent. I am in favor of the general principle involved if it were a resolution expressing sympathy and expressing support. But I am in favor of referring it. I am no friend of the mine owners and I am not in any spirit of antagonism toward the Western Federation of Miners; quite the contrary. My reason for desiring to have the telegram referred to a committee is that it may be considered carefully, phrase by phrase, sentence by sentence, so that we may know whether we have the best and most careful piece of work to send out that can be turned out by any committee. I have great respect for Comrade Miller's judgment usually. I admire Guy Miller as much as any man on the floor of this convention. He is my friend, faithful and just to me. Yet I am bound to say that I do not want to leave the entire matter to Guy Miller. I am not willing, if I am acting in an editorial capacity, to accept an article and submit to a reading of it on the part of the author. Let us have it done where we can talk it over, and if we think we can make it stronger and more effective as a piece of propaganda material, let us do so, and then let us come to the convention with a proposition that we are agreed on. We are not certain that we have got the best telegram to send out. That is my reason for desiring to refer. (Applause.) The motion was put and carried, 93 in favor, 92 opposed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES—(resumed).

The convention then resumed consideration of the report of the Committee on Rules, Del Stehman reporting for the committee. The following references are to the sections as renumbered. The section renumbered 19 was read, as follows:

"19. During the sessions of the convention no smoking shall be allowed on the floor of the convention."

Adopted.

Section 20 was read:

"20. Each delegation shall select one of its members to announce its vote."

Adopted.

Section 21 was read:

"21. Each state delegation, in the absence of any regular delegate, shall designate the alternate who shall fill such vacancy."

Adopted.

Section 22 was temporarily overlooked.

Section 23 was read:

"23. In case of a contest the delegates, both contesting and contested, shall not vote upon such contest."

Adopted.

The next section was read:

"24. A delegate to the International Bureau shall be elected."

Adopted.

Section 22, which had been passed, was then read:

"22. The National Secretary shall have a voice, but no vote."

Adopted.

The next section was read:

"25. The nomination of president and vice-president shall be by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present."

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I move to strike out the whole section. (Seconded; carried.)

The next section was read:

"26. A Committee on Trades Unions, consisting of seven members, shall be elected, not more than one member to serve from each state."

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Comrade Chairman, I think among two hundred delegates there will be at least one point of order inside of sixty seconds. Now, I have no desire to make any speech, but my state has adopted instructions on this particular question instructing our delegates from New Jersey to come here and oppose anything that will look toward any resolution either on craft unionism or industrial unionism; to come here and stand against any motion or act that looked to taking any specific stand or adopting any special resolution for any class, and

particularly in regard to this question of economic organization. And that is why I say that there should be at least some thought given to this subject. It is one of the most important questions, whether it comes up in this shape or in another shape, that this body has to deal with this week in Chicago. I am not in favor of appointing a committee. I am not in favor of taking any action whatever on this matter. I am in favor of making our appeal to the working class in the Socialist party platform.

DEL. MOORE (Pa.): The state of Pennsylvania on several occasions in its state conventions has declared that the working class movement in that state stands for the entire working class. So far as trade unionism is concerned, it is only a fraction of the working class. As certain things arise we will deal with them as they arise, but the trade union has no special significance in the Socialist movement, and we are instructed to vote that way.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): In the state of Nevada we are not only in favor of unionism, but we have some very strong opinions concerning unionism. We have had experience with some forms of unionism, but notwithstanding that, we do not believe in the matter of the Socialist party taking any position on that subject. We believe that there should be no division in the party on this question, either for or against craft unionism. We do not believe that there is anything to be gained by it, and we do believe that the Socialist Party should take no position unless there is some distinct end to be gained. We are opposed to any pronouncement whatever, pro or con, upon this question or any other faction of any portion of society. Therefore I am compelled, in obedience to my constituency that I represent, to oppose any committee or any action of this convention upon any of these facts whatsoever. I believe in prohibition and a lot of other things, but I am not here to vote on any pronouncement of this convention upon any of them. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, move you that this rule be stricken out. (Seconded.)

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I want to

say that my profession is that of a lawyer, and I want to say that this trade union question is a Socialist question, too. I want to say that the Supreme Court of the United States has made a decision which, if it stands, will be equal in the labor movement to what the Dred Scott decision was in the slavery movement. (Applause.) And I want to say to you, speaking from that standpoint, that we want this committee; we want this committee to be appointed. We want the best brains of this organization to bring in a report on this question, and we want to discuss it, because I want to say to you that this labor union movement will not go down; you have got to fight the question out. You have got to begin now, and you have got to have a report, because, so certainly as I stand before you, the labor union movement is now standing on the brink waiting to see which way you will go. In the name of common sense and reason, we, the national party of the working class, are not going to take a stand on this question and say that the trade union treasures shall not be robbed by the capitalist class through the use of the Supreme Court of the United States? (Applause.)

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): I would like to ask you, comrades and friends, if you think that you represent the working class better than the labor organizations? I would like to ask you if you think that a political party is going to carry on the economic fight. The economic fight will have to be carried on on the economic field. You are a political party. You only represent the Socialist movement in one direction. The Socialist movement must be represented on the economic field and on the political field as well. Now, comrades, I know as well as you do that craft unionism has its faults, and let me tell you that nobody knows it so well as the members of craft unionism, the intelligent members who are striving their best to bring the labor organization up where it should be, and who are looking to the Socialists for leadership. Let me tell you, comrades, right in our movement, right in our party, if we decline to help the trade union

movement there, there will be fewer Socialists than there are. Who is it that takes a stand against labor organizations? Are they working men? No. As a rule the men that take a stand against organizations are farmers. Those who take a stand against labor organizations, as a rule, are not working men. The trade union organization represents the working class and we, the Socialist Party, are here to represent the working class. I say to you that the Socialist Party of America is distinct from the International party, from all the Socialist parties of the world.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): Comrade Chairman, it is not, I suppose, a question that we are going to decide at this minute whether or not we want to make a declaration in the name of the Socialist Party of the United States for craft unionism, or for what is called industrial unionism, or against one or the other. That is not the question that is before us this moment. My own opinion, and I believe it will be the opinion of the majority of the delegates, is that whether or not you shall make a declaration for or against either of those forms of industrialism, is a thing that we will yet have to decide in the debates of this convention. The question that is before us now is, are we going to take up the question of trade unionism here and see what we have to say about it, or are we going to decide that we will remain silent on the question of trade unionism at a moment when the whole capitalist press of the country, all the employers' organizations of the country and the courts of the country from police magistrate up to the Supreme Court of the United States are paying attention to the question of unionism. (Applause.) You cannot dodge this question, and if you could dodge this question, you ought not to. You cannot dodge it because after this convention we and our comrades in the party will be going out before the working men to speak for Socialism, and we know that among the working men of whom we speak, at least in the great cities and industrial centers, the greater part of the most active working men, the greater part of those to whom we can most easily appeal, are working men who are or-

ganized in unions of one sort or the other. We will go to them and we will have to say where the Socialist Party stands on the question of trade unionism, and we want to know where it stands, we want our speakers to know; and if we say to them, "Your trade unions are only a part of the working class, and therefore we Socialists have not thought it worth while to consider anything about trade unionism," what will they answer to us? They will answer to us, "Yes, in numbers we of the trade unions are only a part of the working class, but in numbers you of the Socialist Party are even a good deal smaller part of the working class." They will answer to us, "You Socialists claim that although your numbers are so few, yet you represent the ultimate interests of the working class. But we hold just the same that we whose numbers are greater may at least claim to represent the very important immediate interests of the working class." And if we are candid we will have to say that they are right. They do represent the interests of the working class upon the industrial field in the struggle from day to day. They do represent the interests of the working class upon the industrial field in the struggle from day to day. We do represent the interests of the working class, organized and unorganized, their ultimate interests upon the political field, upon that field which is half, the political half of the industrial movement. Our international conventions in the past, our international congresses in the past, without exception, have taken up this question and considered it an important one and have spoken upon it with clearness, with dignity, and I believe generally with wisdom. And if it has happened in one or two states that state conventions, as has been said here, have taken the opposite view and have said, "We are not going to pay any attention to trade unions," then I say it is high time that this national convention of the Socialist Party for the year 1908 should take a stand which will show those one or two states that they are mistaken on this subject. (Applause.)

DEL. IDA CROUCH HAZLETT (Mont.): I wish to speak in favor of

the trade unions, for it seems to me I have noticed already in the conferences of this organization a tendency, as one comrade said on the floor yesterday, to shirk the duty of the Socialist organization. We have shirked away from the Woman's Committee, let the women settle the question themselves, they say. We have apparently tried to shirk away from the Farmers' Committee; let the farmer work his way out, they say. And here I am surprised to see an evident attempt to shirk the question of the relation of the Socialist Party of America to the trade union movement.

Now, it seems to me, that this tendency on the part of our American with the trouble we have in various Socialist Party has a great deal to do states in appealing to the labor organizations. I noticed, I think in a recent number of the International Review, a statement that the American working man, that organized labor looks upon the Socialist Party almost with aversion. We find that in state after state, and in my travels, so far as I can see, I only find two states where that is not the case: one in Wisconsin and the other in Montana. Now, it seems to me that if we are to accomplish anything at all we have got to show ourselves as the political expression of the working class which fights its battles along the line of organized labor; and it seems to me of the utmost importance at this convention, when we find the courts against us, when we find their decisions heavily bearing upon trade union men and organized labor, as in Montana where we are suffering under the heaviest injunction ever issued from any Federal court, and the most sweeping injunction against the treasures of the organizations as in England in the Taff Vale decision, the Socialist Party can only save itself as we have done, by coming to the rescue and fighting the battles of organized labor and letting the organs of the party go to work and get in the breach. It seems to me, if we wish to avoid the danger in England and to avoid the danger in England and several other countries, of organized labor slipping away from the revolutionary movement that claims to be a representative of the working class when it is not such and is not recognized as such, that we have not

only got to appoint a committee to handle the trade union situation fairly, but I think that we ought to do so and what is of vast importance, and what I myself am in favor of, is making a ringing declaration here, in our platform or somewhere opposing the injunctions used by the capitalist class against us. (Applause.) Unless we do something of that sort it will be impossible for us to reach organized labor. We should really have their interests at heart instead of fighting them as we do in nearly every state in the union. In the large cities our Socialist speakers stand up and arraign the leaders in the labor organizations and call them all sorts of names and call them fakirs and all that, so what wonder that organized labor is indifferent to Socialism. Hence, I am in favor of a trade union committee, and a good strong one, composed of the best minds on this question. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Our party in Milwaukee is absolutely proletarian. We have the trades union movement with us in Milwaukee. I may say that above ninety per cent—ninety-five per cent probably—of our vote is a working class vote. We have only about two and a half lawyers in our ranks—not enough to fill the offices. But I tell you that we have got our hold on the working men in Milwaukee by preaching and organizing a labor movement with two arms—a political arm and an economic arm. We do not say that the economic movement—that the trade union—is of greater importance than the political movement—the Socialist Party—is of greater importance than the trades union movement. We do not want to go into trades unions and tell them what they are to do; we do not do that in Milwaukee—but, on the other hand, we won't permit the trades unions to come over to the Socialist Party and dictate to us, as a party, what to do. We keep the two absolutely apart; but, nevertheless, we get every trades union man as such.

Whenever the trades unions have fight on their hands in any way we support the trades unions loyally, and whenever we go to the ballot box—as a party—every trades union mar-

supports us loyally or he must explain why not.

We have the trades unions; we have the organized working class of Milwaukee with us. That part of the working class we do not have—the proletarians in Milwaukee which we are still to get—are the workmen not yet organized, the foreign elements, the Poles and the Slavonians, the Italians, and so forth. These we do not get. And that is how the Democratic party won the election this spring. But the American working men, the men who are intelligent, the men who are organized, the men who study the situation and the needs of their class—the men that can read and think—those men we get.

I tell you, comrades, I can't go back to Milwaukee and tell them that the National Socialist Convention has even refused to appoint a committee to consider the trades unions and the trades union question.

I tell you that I know the international Socialist movement as well as anybody on the floor of this convention. I am probably as old a Socialist as anybody on the floor of this convention. I have probably done as much work for the movement as any one man on the floor of this convention. But I declare that if you decide here that you are not going to consider the trades union movement at all, that I am willing to do something decisive. I have been voting for other Socialist parties before—I may vote for a new Socialist party again. At the International Congress in Stuttgart, in Amsterdam, in Paris not only were the different Socialist parties represented, but also many trades unions. The trades unions are always represented at these international congresses. Are we not even to consider them here? It would be suicide to ignore them. Excuse me—my voice has given out and I must stop.

DEL. BERGLYN (Ill.): This is the most remarkable thing I have ever heard. We are about to enter a political campaign with a party that is to pass aside its battle cries that in the past have gathered the working men around its banners.

We are called upon by some of the delegates here to ignore this trades union question. They say we should

ignore it. Now I want this committee for this reason. The question is this: Shall we follow the lead of the men who say they desire that this party shall declare to the world that the present class struggle is none of our business? That is the position taken by some of the delegates in this convention.

Where is this class struggle that we all talk about? Here among this body? Not by a long shot. The street car employees vote that they will strike. What right have we to go among them and sympathize with them, and ask them for their votes, and then say that the trades union question is none of our business? When we rolled up 47,000 votes in Cook County it was not because we said that the trades unions had nothing to do with us. The stock yards strike was on; and we were with the boys in their fight; and they rewarded us by electing two of our members to the legislature. But we didn't have the good sense of the boys in Milwaukee. We could not hold the ground that we had won because we had too many amongst us who said that the trades unions had nothing to do with us. That is the reason we lost ground. I tell you that you will make the mistake of your lives if you exclude this matter from your consideration. Are you going to talk about the Supreme Court decision in the boycott case? Are you going to talk about sending the military to Douglas? Are you going to do that and then say that trades unions and trades unionism is none of your business? What are you going to talk about? Are you going to talk about the man in the moon? Are you going to talk about property rights? Or how to save the farmers? Are you going to tell the fellow who is hanging on by his eye brows how he may hold on with his teeth? Are you going to talk about that? I tell you you have got to make this fight. If the Socialist Party has any right to exist you have got to consider organized labor, in their fights against capitalism.

The members of the trades unions are the fellows who are doing the actual fighting now. Where are you

going to be? Are you for them or against them? Are you for the capitalists or against them? You must consider trades unionism.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): We have the right to discuss this question, and we ought to discuss this question. And we are all agreed upon it if we look upon it in the right way. I think it is the wording of that resolution that causes all the trouble. Those men who favor industrial organization are opposed to the wording, "trades unions." Comrade Lee made the point that they do not want a resolution in favor of or against craft unionism or industrial unionism. What we want—what we all want, in fact—is a resolution in favor of organized labor. Is that right?

Now then, Mr. Chairman, with that in view I move to amend the resolution so as to substitute for the words "trades unions" the words "labor organizations."

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I came here to abide by the decision of this convention. I came here with the purpose of letting this convention settle these difficulties. And if the Milwaukee delegation has come with any other intention, or with any other idea in their minds than that, we would like to know it and know it now.

Milwaukee is here participating in a national convention of the Socialist Party, and the National Socialist Party is not participating in a Milwaukee convention. I repeat that we have come here ready to abide by the decision of this convention.

I am an industrialist. I am opposing the resolution to indorse trades unions, but understand, if this convention passes such a resolution I shall certainly abide by the decision of the convention; and I shall then go back home and support it. And I shall give all my time on the platform to propagating the principles set forth in our platform; because I am a Socialist and believe in abiding by the decision of this body in convention assembled. But get this into your minds clearly, that if we shall have a political and an economic wing in this movement, that that economic wing should be

an exact expression of the industrial movement, and that we must control that movement politically.

If it is your idea and your intention to push a resolution in this convention in favor of craft organization it will be opposed as long as we can stand here and oppose it.

I wish to say that I appreciate the position of the delegates from both Pennsylvania and New Jersey. I expected to take some when I came here. I did not expect to get all that I advocate in this convention. But we do not intend to lie down and let them run through a trades union resolution in this convention without protesting as long as we can be heard. Understand, if you have a majority and decide for trades organization it will be over our protest, but we will obey the decision of this convention and be governed by this convention; and not be frightened by any threat of Milwaukee delegates to bolt this convention. If the Milwaukee delegation have the idea that they will bolt I suppose there is room in the Populist band wagon—since the Socialist movement in America does not altogether revolve around the Milwaukee organization. The thing for us to consider is this: if we are to pass a resolution in this convention relative to the organized labor movement of this country let it be sweeping so that it will include every labor organization in America. Then I can go back to my constituency; I can take my place on the platform; I can tell the member of the Industrial Workers of the World; I can tell every member of the Farmers' Union, and every state organization in America that we have declared for organized labor in this convention, and that will satisfy them, and that will satisfy every fair-minded man in this convention. And any other man certainly wants to bolt this convention.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I am very much interested in watching this cyclone coming from the Western and Southwestern states and passing through this convention. Do you know what it means? It means, getting rid of all verbiage and all the oratory, this breath of the new Socialist zeal from the Western prairies means the repudiation of Karl Marx

and you ought to take his picture down. It means the repudiation of the authority not alone of Karl Marx, but the authority of every International convention that has ever been held connected with Socialism, and it means the repudiation of all the declarations that have ever been made by every Socialist convention, including the last one in this hall four years ago, and it means, reduced to its essence, impossibility again, instead of Socialism.

The previous question was ordered. DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. There are comrades who have taken the floor who have expressed my opinion. Others will take the floor who will not express my opinion. I believe this matter will go through and that this amendment will be adopted. I hope it will.

It has been said here by some that organized labor should not be considered by the Socialist party, but at the present time I believe that will be a mistake.

Four years ago I was instructed to support a position in the convention in opposition to the recognition of organized labor. When the roll-call was taken on that matter it was 107 in favor of the resolution, in favor of the trades union movement, and 42 against. I registered my vote against it, but I am here to say that within the last four years the development of the class struggle in the economic field has convinced me that it is necessary for this organization in convention assembled to express itself by voting its best wishes to the organized labor movement.

In the last ten days I have had a warm discussion with a high official of one of the building trades organizations on this political question, the trades union movement, and I made the statement to him that in my opinion seventy-five per cent of organized labor in America is ready for political action, and it is my opinion today that this convention could do nothing better than to appeal to organized labor in America to take political action in harmony with the Socialist movement.

I want to say that the labor organizations are coming to a point where

they will be forced to take this action, and we want a ringing appeal to organized labor to recognize that fact. I want to say you have more to expect from the two and a half millions of organized workers of this country than you have from the sixteen or eighteen millions of the unorganized in pushing your propaganda.

That is the point to be looked at and considered now. Your organized Socialist movement with its fifty thousand members is doing a lot more than the four hundred or five hundred thousand who are not organized. If you organize the labor movement in America regardless of its trade, crafts or industrial organization, if they can be lined up in a harmonious movement, in sympathy with our political movement, it is going to be an immense factor in our future success.

DEL. CANNON (Arizona): I wish to speak in favor of the appointment of the committee. We have been told that this is one of the most important questions that is coming before this convention, and the very delegation which tells us that, tells us that we should ignore the most important question that is coming before us. I am surprised that a delegation should come in here and tell us that we should not take any action on the trades union question, where in his own State of Nevada a scab union has been trying to break up the Western Federation of Miners, and where in Goldfield one union is struggling for its life and another union with a character from the Federation tries to strangle it.

I want to go on record, and the delegates from Nevada will see that it does go on record. We have a delegation from New Jersey that tells us that this question is very important and then says we ought to ignore it. That is what New Jersey demands, and they come from the home of almost every giant trust in the United States, and then tell us that there should be nothing done for the trades unions.

There are two kinds of unionism, and both of them cannot be right. There are two forms of unionism—one is class unionism and the other is craft unionism.

We are talking about the class

struggle. Let us put it in practice. Let us endorse the class form of unionism. Let us point out to the American wageworker how he can better the conditions under which he suffers.

We condemn in our political platform Sam Gompers for telling the workmen to keep out of politics and then propose to keep this Socialist convention from going into the union question, which is identically Sam Gompers' and deserves no more credit than does his stand.

Fellow delegates, we have got to take one side or the other on this question. I do not believe that this convention is going to be too cowardly to take sides.

As to the wording of the rules that have been read to you, I am not going to dispute about that now. But I do want a committee appointed and I want to see the committee prepare a report here, and when the committee brings in its report you will fight it out on the floor of this convention. I am in favor of having the committee appointed, but if there are State delegations which are afraid to go on record I want to go on record for Arizona. We are not afraid to go on record.

Because you are told that the question is important is no reason why you should ignore it. If it is important you should discuss it and take a stand on it, and it is an important question. Let us discuss it and let us take a stand on it.

DEL. JOS. E. COHEN (Pa.): As I understand it, we are here for the purpose of legislating that which we believe will be for the best interests of the working class of America at this particular time. We are not here for the purpose of being influenced by threats of bolts by one arm of the labor movement, or threats from any place.

We are not here for the purpose of discussing the condition of the Socialist movement in Germany, nor do we desire to make our party a second edition of the S. L. P. The Socialist Party of Pennsylvania at every convention has recognized the power of the injunction and has been against it. It has always resolved in favor of the working class in whatever

particular struggle they were engaged, whether it was in Colorado or the striking car men down in Chester.

The position of the Socialist Party is that the trades unionist—and I am one among them—are not a privileged element in the working class of America, nor is any other class. It is true that we can control them better than we can unorganized labor, but they are not a privileged element in the working class.

It seems to us that if you want a resolution you can have it, but that it is not necessary to elect a special committee to bring in a special report for a special section of the working class. It seems to me that you can just as well pass a resolution if you want to without having a resolution that will be brought in by people who are in favor of one kind of unionism as against another.

Comrade Lee has said that we want a resolution that will be neither in favor of nor opposed to any particular kind of union. Have you got such a resolution now? Comrade Lee thinks so.

But I can give you the evidence of an alternate of New York who does not think so, but who thinks that the present resolution is for the purpose of obscuring the issue and appealing to the craft unionists as against the industrial unionists.

If we want a resolution for organized labor, I don't think there is one man from Pennsylvania who will vote against it, provided it goes in as a resolution for organized labor, providing it recognizes the struggles of organized labor and not merely an appeal for votes so that members in Illinois or in Milwaukee, or somewhere else, can go out and say, "Look here, you vote for us, because we are in favor of you."

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I am opposed to the appointment of a committee on trades unions. I think the committee getting up the order of business favored the establishment of too many committees. We might as well have a committee on lawyers. I think the Socialist Party has always stated its position on trades union matters. The Socialist Party of the Pacific coast, a great many of its members at least, have opinions on

this question, and the delegates from California even offered a resolution on this question, expressing their views that they think ought to have gone to the committee on platform.

I want to say another thing. Since it has been charged here that the Pacific coast people, the farmers of the Rocky Mountain states and so on, forget so many of the doctrines and so much of the philosophy of Marx, and it is called new Socialism, I want to say that there are some of us on the Pacific coast who have been members of the Socialist Party since 1891, and we have certain views about the class struggle, and one of our positions on the class struggle is this: That a contest as to whether a workman is going to receive a dollar and a half or a dollar and sixty cents a day is no part of the class struggle. A DELEGATE: That is all you know about it.

DEL. OSBORNE: Our conception of the class struggle is not a struggle as to commodity organization. Our position is that the working class is engaged in a revolutionary struggle in the political field. Our position is that the class struggle is a struggle by the capitalist organization to hold its political power. And nothing short of that rises to the dignity of a class struggle.

As to the Socialist movement, so far as our Pacific coast and Rocky Mountain states are concerned, my position is that while we have not so large a per cent of membership as other sections of the United States, yet that we have the most active body in the party that is to be found in the United States.

It looks to us that this is not a practical thing in the Socialist movement. Our position is that we are ready to go on record as favoring organizations of labor, in their economic struggle, whatever it may be. But at the same time we believe it our duty to work for the industrial form of unionism as best suited to develop that solidarity in the working class that is necessary to success.

Amendment carried. Motion as amended carried.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I want to ask for the election of a committee

of five to consider the attitude of the Socialist Party to the commission form of government in municipalities. And I now make the motion that we elect a committee of five to examine into and report on this question. (Seconded.)

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): The commission form of government is something that has arisen in Oklahoma. There are about twenty towns that want to adopt it. So far the Socialist Party has no official declaration of its attitude in that matter, and it is for that reason that I ask for the election of this committee so that we may know what should be the stand of the Socialist Party nationally, as well as within the different states on this question. The commission form of government is for this purpose. It is to do away with the election of officials by the various parties, and it is to be a non-partisan form of government by non-partisan officials. For that reason the delegates from Oklahoma ask for the election of a committee, so as to investigate whether it is advisable for the Socialist Party there to oppose or help along in the formation of these commission forms of government. I will add that I know hardly anything about it because we have not had it yet. But they are trying to force it upon us.

Motion carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: A question is now on the adoption of the rules as a whole. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HILLS (Iowa): There is one rule that ought to be killed. I think we have had enough of delegations nominating their favorite son without first finding out whether he will accept. I think it nonsense for us to take the time of this convention in trying to nominate and elect committeemen who do not want to serve. So I think it ought to be the sense of this convention that no comrade here should make any nomination unless he has first got the consent of the one nominated and his promise to serve if elected. I think that ought to be the rule. (Seconded.) Carried. The rules as a whole were adopted as amended.

Adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Convention was called to order at 2 p. m.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first business will be the supplemental report of the Committee on Credentials. Comrade Solomon will read the report for the Committee.

DEL. SOLOMON: The Committee on Credentials reports the seating of Comrade J. S. Lampman, as alternate, in place of J. S. Bassett of North Dakota.

With reference to the Washington contested delegation, the Committee makes the following report:

MAJORITY REPORT ON WASHINGTON CASE.

Whereas, the Provisional Committee of the Socialist Party in Washington present no delegates to be seated in this convention, and inasmuch as the matter of their recognition as a Socialist organization is still to be passed upon by the National Executive Committee, this Committee does not consider that it has any jurisdiction in the matter and can only recommend that these delegates who have presented proper credentials be seated.

We further recommend that the National Executive Committee be called upon to take up the matter at once and report its findings and recommendations to the national convention.

In the matter of the Nebraska controversy the Committee reports the seating of Comrade G. C. Porter, and recommends in the case of Comrade Porter that he be seated permanently as he was seated temporarily yesterday. The reason for this is that we do not consider it is within the province of the Committee on Credentials to pass on the acts of the National Executive Committee, they having already passed on the matter prior to our meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection we will take up the report of the Credentials Committee serially.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): I am a member of that Committee, and have a minority report. A minority of the committee desires to make a minority report. I have placed in the hands of your secretary a copy of the minority report which I wish to have read to this convention.

THE SECRETARY: There are two minority reports.

DEL. REILLY: This is the minority report on the Washington contest. This minority agrees with the committee in all its recommendations, except one particular phase of the Washington contest. I will read the report and it will make our disagreements clear to you.

The minority report was read, differing from the majority report in that it did not favor referring to National Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other minority reports?

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The report signed by H. C. Tuck and Geo. E. Boomer is the next one. I will read it.

MINORITY REPORT ON NEBRASKA CASE.

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Credentials, dissent from the decision of the majority in recommending the seating of G. C. Porter as delegate from Nebraska and refusing to consider the claims of the contestants on their merits, for the following reasons:

1. It appears from the evidence that the National Executive Committee has overridden the rights of the state organization by declaring Nebraska unorganized when there were sixteen locals in good standing.

2. It appears from the evidence that G. C. Porter is an expelled member of the Socialist Party, having been expelled from his local.

We therefore recommend that the case of Nebraska be heard upon its merits by this convention.

H. C. Tuck.

Geo. E. Boomer.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): I am one of the protesters. I move a substitute amendment that the minority report be accepted.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): Does it appear from the minority report that G. C. Porter is not a dues-paying member?

DEL. SOLOMON: I desire to state that there has been no evidence whatever presented to show that Comrade Porter is not a member in good standing in the party today. There has been a rumor given out by the contestants that it may be so, and that Comrade Porter has been expelled from the party, although the comrades who made that statement are not members of the party themselves.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): I want to ask would it not be well before action is taken on that minority report to have our comrade Secretary Barnes inform us whether Comrade Porter is not a member at large.

DEL. TUCK: The information has been asked in regard to Porter. The secretary of the Credentials Committee, Comrade Solomon, has stated that there was no evidence before the Committee to support the statement that he has been expelled from his local. I wish to deny the statement of the secretary. Comrade Spence, who had a paid-up membership card in the State of Nebraska, a member at large, appeared and gave testimony before that committee and declared his willingness to make oath that he attended the meeting of the local in which Mr. Porter was a member, and was present at the time the action was taken expelling him. Mr. Porter was present and was asked in regard to the matter. He admitted that charges had been preferred against him, that he had been notified, but had declined to appear before the local and preferred to come to Chicago. Those are the facts as I heard them, and my hearing is good.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): I would say for the information of the delegates here that we have unmistakable evidence, through our secretary, Comrade Barnes, that Porter is a dues paying member of the Socialist Party from the State of Nebraska. If Porter has been turned out of the party it has been since he left Nebraska. No evidence has reached this convention or this committee that he has been turned out, except from the faction that is contesting his seat. There has been no letter received by the National Secretary in regard to it. The question is as to whether or not we should consider the action of the National Executive Committee which declares the Nebraska movement unorganized, as conclusive, or whether we should report that we have nothing whatever to do with it, and seat the delegate, Comrade Porter, who stands as a regular dues-paying member of the Party. To make it clear, the National Executive Committee declared the Nebraska movement unorganized and requested all of them to begin paying dues to the National Secretary. It seems that the Porter faction availed themselves of that decision and began paying dues to the National Secretary. The other faction did not do so, but kept aloof on the ground that the National Executive Committee had overridden the constitution of the Party in declaring the Nebraska movement unorganized. It was not a matter for this Committee to say whether the National Executive Committee had done the right thing or not. All we could do was to pass upon the evidence before us as to the accredited delegates from Nebraska, and we have done this.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I want to say a few words particularly to uphold the minority report which I signed—also to plead with some of my comrades here for some show of fairness. If a member of a committee tries to do his duty according to the evidence that is submitted, it is absolutely unfair for a delegate to say that he tried to do crooked work and could not. I say again that we had no knowledge whatever from Secretary Barnes or anybody else, that Comrade Porter was in good standing. We heard rumors to the

effect that he might be a member at large. We did have evidence submitted by members of the Party in good standing that Mr. Porter had been expelled by his own faction and his own local, after having been notified of charges and failing to appear. I signed that report on that one ground only, and I stand on the ground that when a member of the Party has been expelled we cannot in justice to ourselves recognize as a delegate on the floor, an expelled member of the Party.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair can perhaps secure for you that information. It seems to be a question as to whether Comrade Barnes did say or did not say that this delegate in question was a member in good standing or not. I want to ask if National Secretary Barnes is in the building. The difficulty is that we are arguing on a statement purporting to have been made by the National Secretary.

DEL. TUCK: I deny it. He made no such statement as to Barnes. He said nothing to me whatever.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): If you will just listen I think you will get this straight in about half a minute. The National Executive Committee, owing to the state of confusion in Nebraska, declared the state to be unorganized. Under those circumstances there was only one way for a delegate to be elected to this convention, viz., by a referendum conducted under the auspices and direction of the national office. That election was so concluded. Comrade Barnes placed in the hands of the Credentials Committee a credential properly signed by himself as national secretary, certifying Comrade G. C. Porter as delegate elected by the referendum of the comrades of Nebraska. The vote I think was something like 60 to 15. I don't remember just exactly, but at any rate that is immaterial. Now then, on Friday last, in that unorganized condition, with the controversy existing, knowing that Comrade Porter was on his way or about to make his way to Chicago, some comrades in Omaha who were members of the same faction, brought charges against him on grounds that do not bear at all on his personal character or his standing in the Party, and at a meeting of his

local introduced a motion to expel him from the Party. He had been notified, but had already made arrangements to be in Chicago. He did not think they were justified in bringing charges or expelling him without a fair trial, so he came on to Chicago. The Credentials Committee believed that he was justified in coming here with his credentials, and we have recommended that he be seated because he was elected by a referendum of the Party, properly taken, and whatever expulsion there was simply a part of the controversy that was in progress there and simply for the purpose of unsettling him at this convention and for no other purpose whatever.

DEL. SCHWARTZ (Pa.): I rise to a point of information. I am a member of the Credentials Committee and I would like to ask the Credentials Committee when they held this meeting to listen to this case in Nebraska. I was not invited to the meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate is not in order. Whatever he has to say to the Credentials Committee should be said to them, by him. The National Secretary is present, and it is well for him at this time, as his name has been brought into this discussion from the floor.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Regarding the delegate from Nebraska and his election the referendum for the same was conducted under the direction of the National organization. In agreement with the National Executive Committee, the National Committee concurred in the withdrawal of the charter of the Nebraska state organization, at the December session of the National Executive Committee. Since that time a number of locals comprising many more members than were represented in the former organization, have attached themselves to the national organization, as locals directly attached. The referendum was conducted from the national office and Comrade Porter received an overwhelming majority, all comrades voting who are attached through their locals to the national organization. Comrade Porter is a good standing member of the National Party, according to the action taken by the National Executive Committee and the National Credentials Committee. I did not hear any of the discussion

I do not know whether there are other points that you desire to have presented. I am prepared to answer any other questions.

DEL. CHENOWETH (Idaho): I would like to ask Secretary Barnes how it is possible for a local to be organized in the State of Nebraska when there is no State organization, and if that is true, how can a local expel Comrade Porter from the organization if he is directly attached to the national organization? How can this minority of the Committee on Credentials bring in such a report as that presented here?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: A number of locals have been chartered by the National Executive Committee, since the action taken in December, consequently there are a number of locals properly organized.

DEL. TUCK: Upon what constitutional grounds did the National Executive Committee in December take away the charter from the state organization of Nebraska? I am rising to a point of information.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I think that is entirely true; and also that the National Executive Committee is capable of answering for its own acts. I think it ought not to devolve upon me to give the reasons for what they have done.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I want to ask the Secretary whether he has signed the credentials of Comrade Porter?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I have. I have signed Comrade Porter's credentials, as I have signed the credentials of all delegates from unorganized states.

DEL. BERGER: And the election was conducted by the regular referendum vote?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: As regular as the national office ever conducts, and that is regular. I want to make a statement to the Committee on Credentials, that after they left the national office this morning a letter came from Local Omaha addressed to them, and a copy of it to me, saying that Comrade Porter was expelled or suspended the other evening. This they have not received as an official communication, but it will be here this afternoon.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): A point of information that I want the convention to have, as well as to have myself so as to act intelligently. I want to get it direct from Secretary Barnes. Comrade Barnes, as the National Secretary, has issued charters to locals in Nebraska as an unorganized state; that unorganized membership, as far as the state is concerned, has elected by a majority a comrade as a delegate. It has been called in question as to whether he was a member of the Party or not, and this information I want Comrade Barnes to give. If he is a member of the Party, I, as a Party man, will stand by him.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Porter is a member in good standing, having his due book, which I have seen, showing his dues all paid up.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I desire some information. Before I can vote intelligently on this question I desire this information. Secretary Barnes declines to give the information. Therefore I make a motion to invite Comrade Work or Comrade Gaylord to give us the information, that is, on what ground did the National Executive Committee revoke the charter of Nebraska?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will make a statement which I trust you will listen to. We have called upon the Secretary to give such information as he possesses. If he has exhausted his fund of information then we will pass him over, and take up the National Executive Committee. The Convention will be in order. Is there any other question to be asked of the National Secretary?

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I want to ask Secretary Barnes this question. It has already been stated that Comrade Porter is a member in good standing. I want to ask whether these men who are contesting Porter's place, whether they are members in good standing or not?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Every person in Nebraska, who had been affiliated with the party, including the persons in question, were repeatedly solicited to attach themselves to the national organization under the ruling of the several committees. These persons have held aloof and are not affiliated with the national organization.

DEL. UNTERMANN (Idaho): About the letter received this morning, what names were attached to that letter? What side did it come from, the statement that Porter was expelled? Were they members of the Party?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It is signed by the secretary of the local that is affiliated, Local Omaha. I cannot remember the name of the secretary who signed it; possibly somebody can help me out.

A DELEGATE: Martelli?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Martelli; that is the name.

A DELEGATE: I am a member of the Credentials Committee and I wish to state that I am in favor of the majority report. Whether Porter was a member in good standing or not seems to resolve itself down to a question of veracity. Shall we believe Barnes or shall we believe the contesting delegation, that have no proofs at all to offer in support of their statement, except their own assertion. On the other hand, Comrade Barnes is authority for the statement that Porter is a member in good standing and the others were not. Now they tell us that these people were given every opportunity to avail themselves of the situation, to enter the national organization by becoming a part of the national organization, and this they refused to do. And they come here now to fight for it. They talk about fair play. They don't want fair play. We have given them every opportunity to get fair play; and for that reason I am in favor of the majority report.

A DELEGATE: Has Comrade Porter of Nebraska been granted a membership-at-large card during the past week?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Not to my knowledge, and I would know.

A DELEGATE: What is the date of the letter from the secretary of the Omaha local stating that Porter was expelled; what is the date of that letter?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I think it was dated Saturday.

A DELEGATE: Does it give the date of his expulsion?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: No; according to my recollection it runs like

this: "This is to inform you that Comrade Porter has been expelled, and you may ask for all further information that you desire on the subject." Giving no information. That is about the substance of it.

A DELEGATE: Is it a fact that Local Omaha was expelled from membership by the State Committee of Nebraska in January, 1907?

NAT. SEC. BARNES: It was reported that they were expelled. They mutually expelled each other. That is the point.

Question put. Minority report rejected. Majority report adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the majority and minority reports relating to the State of Washington. The question comes upon the motion to substitute the minority report for the majority.

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I am a member of the "despotic" National Executive Committee, and I know that we cannot take up this matter and discuss it before the convention adjourns. The members of the National Executive Committee, with the exception of one, are delegates to the convention and we have convention business and convention committees to attend. This matter will take a lot of time. I think the two members of the Credentials Committee who signed the minority report have the right idea of the subject—but I would add that the delegates take their seats in the convention and let the matter be disposed of after the convention, after the Washington comrades have sent in their request in the proper manner for a referendum vote in that State.

DEL. GOEBEL (N.J.): Now, Mr. Chairman and Comrades, I think I have an intelligent reason for opposing this motion. As a national organizer I have been twice to the State of Washington. I have no interest whatever in either side of this controversy, but I, like the rest of you, have a great interest in the Socialist cause and the spread of Socialist principles. I stand here—and I know what will be the consequences of standing here, in my work as organizer, from those whom I oppose, and yet I stand here and put the Socialist movement in Washing-

ton has been paralyzed by the action of those who call themselves Socialists. I stand here and say that as organizer I found my work interfered with repeatedly by those who were supposed to be the organization. I worked like a dog to overcome the consequences of the action of those who called themselves Socialists. The State Committee arranged my route, and three days later I saw letters written by those same people knocking me and urging that they insist that I be taken out of the state. Under such circumstances, something is wrong. Why should we not deal with the matter now? I know the obstructionists up there, and their one purpose is delay. Let us deal with the matter right now and get the Socialist movement in Washington in shape to go forward in this presidential campaign. Let us put the "leaders" of both sides in the hole, and get down to the rank and file. Why should we defer? Right here in Chicago we have the representatives of both sides. On the one side we have the ablest men they have, with the exception of Titus. They can state their side; the committee can hear them. On the other hand we have Hutcheson, the leader on the other side, a man that has sacrificed a great deal for the Socialist movement—he can talk for that side.

If you leave it to the National Executive Committee to deal with after the convention, there will be a mass of correspondence and a great deal of necessary delay. The next thing you know the presidential campaign is upon us, and matters not being settled our work will not go forward in Washington as it ought. The rank and file on both sides feel that both sides ought to agree to immediate action. We don't know which side is right, but we do know there is wrong on both sides. I suggest, therefore, that being the case, that we declare Washington unorganized, so that the national secretary can ask of the rank and file of Washington to say who they really want, whether it is the Titus crowd or the other crowd, and let it be decided so that in one month or six weeks we will have everything going along in a straight line.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): There is a very logical reason why as a mem-

ber of the credentials committee I support this recommendation of the committee: Comrade Hutcheson came before the committee; we said, "What evidence have you?" He said, "The evidence is in the national office." We asked why they had not got it, and the answer was that it was addressed to the National Executive Committee. It was understood that the National Executive Committee would hold its session previous to the session of the convention. They voted not to do so. Their vote not to hold their meeting previous to the convention was taken at a time after this material was addressed to them. Consequently it was not competent for us to receive mail addressed to the National Executive Committee. At any rate we did not feel that we had authority to call for it and take the matter out of their hands. Now then, the comrades are here from both sides. We feel that the time to attend to this is now, while they are all here. The matter is of national importance, and the comrades are all here. The committee do not feel that it is their business to decide a matter which the constitution says shall be handled by the National Executive Committee. We therefore ask that they take it up, address themselves to it at once and report to this convention.

DEL. CLARK (Texas): It is true that there are merits on both sides. To go away from this convention without considering the contesting delegations I believe would be a crime against the Socialist Party of Washington. Any organization that will come all the way from Washington here in the effort to do something to harmonize the differences that now exist in Washington and demand that it be threshed out in this convention, certainly have some strong reason for making this effort. Now, comrades, if I had known that the National Executive Committee was going to turn down the consideration of this question I never would have decided as I did. It was the object of our recommendation that this question should be settled by the National Executive Committee. We can run this convention without them while they settle this important question. Let them

bringing their evidence back here to this convention and report it; and, for God's sake, let us not have another Nebraska question.

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I move a substitution for the whole, that the delegates from Washington be seated in full in this convention. (Seconded; lost)

Minority report rejected. Majority report adopted. Report relating to North Dakota adopted.

NOMINATIONS.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I have an emergency matter that I desire to put before the convention. The local organization desires to arrange for a ratification meeting not later than Saturday night. To do that they must rent a hall and prepare for that meeting. To have the assurance that that ratification meeting will be held, it wants this convention to fix the latest hour at which the national nominations will be made, so that we may go ahead with our arrangements to ratify the work of this convention Saturday night if possible. Now, I make a motion, and you may amend it, that nominations for president and vice president shall be made by this convention not later than the adjournment on Thursday night. (Seconded; carried.)

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

DEL. GUY E. MILLER (Colo.): I desire to make a motion in regard to the organization of this convention, providing for another committee on the question of—well, I guess its title might as well be "organization." I want to say that the membership of this committee ought to include all the national organizers, all the State Secretaries and as many members of the National Executive Committee as can attend those sessions, in an attempt to systematize propaganda and to indicate the lines along which information should be gathered. I move you that we elect a committee of nine under the title of Organization. (Seconded.)

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I do not believe it is necessary for us to elect another committee of nine on the question of organization when we

have a Committee on Ways and Means. I believe it is within the province of that committee to bring in reports on the question of organization. Therefore I move as an amendment that this matter be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendment seconded and carried.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business, according to the list as arranged by the Committee on Rules and handed to me, is the appointment or election of two assistant secretaries. Strickland of Indiana, and Reilly of New Jersey, were elected.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now appoint as Sergeant-at-arms Delegate John Collins of Illinois, and suggest as his first duty that he open the windows.

JUDGES AND TELLERS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is the election of four tellers and two judges to act in case of written ballots. The following were elected tellers: Penrose of Arkansas, L. E. Floaten of Colorado, Gerber of New York, O'Hare of Oklahoma. The following were elected judges: Ambrose of Montana, Bental of Illinois.

COMMITTEES.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next on the list is a Committee on Platform, of nine, not more than one from each State. Proceed to nominate. The chair does not recognize any motion during the nominations, so that you will all have a chance.

Nominations for Committee on Platform were made, vote taken by ballot, and the judges and tellers retired to count the vote.

DEL. PAULITSCH (N. Y.): I move that we proceed to the nominations for the committees. I move, also, that those accepting the nominations for the various committees shall have their names placed on printed ballots and that the vote shall be taken by means of those ballots and those receiving the highest votes shall be the choice of this convention. Any comrade being elected to two commit-

tees to choose which one he will serve on. (Seconded; carried.)

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I move that in case of the withdrawal of an elected delegate from one committee the next highest shall be declared a member of that committee.

The motion was duly seconded and carried.

Nominations were then made for the Committee on Constitution, Committee on Women, Press Committee, Auditing Committee, and Ways and Means Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The tellers are ready to report the vote on Committee on Platform.

The tellers reported Simons, Hillquit, Untermann, Carey, Work, Clark, Berger, Miller of Colorado, and O. F. Branstetter elected as Platform Committee.

Nominations were then made for the Committee on Farmers' Program, the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations, and partly for the Committee on Labor Organizations. Adjourned.

THIRD DAY'S SESSION

Del. Carey, chairman of yesterday, called the convention to order at 10 o'clock a. m. The secretary read the following communications:

"Nashua, Minn.
"To the National Convention, Socialist Party of America.

"Our hearty congratulations to the comrades at the convention, and best wishes for success in the great work. On behalf of Finnish Socialist Local, Nashua, Minn.

"Charles Telman,
"H. Cherry."

"Augusta, Ga.

"Socialist National Convention,
Brand's Hall.

"Greetings from Local, Augusta. Our cheers for America's greatest convention.

(Signed)
"Mrs. A. W. Milquist."

"Montreal, Que.

"J. Mahlon Barnes, Secretary Socialist Party, U. S. A.

"The Socialists of Montreal in meeting assembled send Socialist greetings to your National Convention. Comrades, let us have Socialism in our time.

"The Canadian Socialist Party, Montreal.
"Schleckman and Wright,"
"Committee."

"Sacramento, Cal.

"National Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"All hail to the comrades and fel-

low-workers assembled for the important work to lay out plans and select presidential candidates. Three cheers for Socialism.

(Signed) "John Sason."

"Jersey City, N. J.

"Secretary Socialist Party Convention, Brand's Hall.

"With you for Socialism.

(Signed)

"Executive Committee Polish Socialist Alliance,
"C. Panki, Secretary."

"To the Delegates of the National Convention of the Socialist Party.

"Dear Comrades: Local Cook County has 98 branches located in different parts of the county, the great majority of them located in Chicago. Many of these branches carry on soap box campaigns during the warm season. This constitutes one of our best methods of propaganda. Knowing that many of the delegates in attendance are the regular soap-boxers in other parts of the country, we are desirous of using their presence in that capacity here in Chicago. We would fraternally request every delegate who is a public speaker to volunteer his services by leaving his name and address with the secretary of Local Cook County, who can be found among the Illinois delegation or at the booth of the Harp.

"Yours for Socialism,

"G. T. Fraenckel,
"County Secretary."

"To the National Convention of the Socialist Party.

"Dear Comrades: The Russian Social Democratic Society of Chicago sends its greetings to the representatives of the class conscious proletariat of the United States of America. Now that dark clouds are gathering over the troubled seas of capitalism, may this convention of the Socialist Party stand out like a beacon for those still groping in the dark, pointing the way to Socialism and freedom. Long live the International proletariat. Long live Socialism.

"Fraternally,
"Russian Social Democratic Society of Chicago."

Del. Slayton, of Pennsylvania, was elected chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrades, I feel that you want to do business today, and if you do not do it you have got to ride over the top of your humble servant; so now be prepared to do it. (Applause.)

The nominations for the Committee on Labor Organizations were completed and nominations were made for the Committee on Government by Commission.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I move that we have the report of the Executive Committee on the Washington affair. The motion was seconded and carried.

REPORT ON WASHINGTON CASE.

The National Executive Committee then made the following report:

DEL. WORK (Iowa): The committee met last evening to pass upon this matter. We have a report to present, and in order to make the report clear I would like to read the amendment to the national constitution adopted last November, which was sought to be invoked in this case. The amendment is as follows:

"In case of controversy in any State as to the validity of the title of its officers and the question of the recognition of the national organization, a referendum of the membership of the state to determine the question may be taken in the following man-

ner: A call signed by not less than one-third of the total membership of the State in good standing at the time the controversy arose, asking the National Executive Committee to take a referendum of the said State membership for the election of officers for the positions in dispute, shall be filed with the National Secretary. Upon receiving such call the National Executive Committee shall take a referendum of the membership of said State for the election of officers for the positions in dispute. All locals appearing on the State list at National headquarters in good standing at the time the controversy arose shall be privileged to make nominations, and all members in good standing at that time shall be entitled to vote.

The National Executive Committee decided that this amendment is not retroactive. It was adopted in November, 1907. I will now read the report:

"The National Executive Committee reports that it met and considered the Washington case, gave each side a hearing and took the following action:

"We reject the protest against the seating of the Washington delegates and the petition for a referendum in the State of Washington, on the ground, first, that since the enactment of the amendment to the national constitution in November, 1907, no controversy has arisen in the State of Washington; second, that the State organization of the Socialist Party in Washington against which the protest is made, is the duly, regularly constituted committee of the party in Washington. We recommend that the national organization offer its good services to the State Committee of Washington in an effort to bring about unity between the contending sides."

DEL. WORK: I would like to say further, that, as I understand it, this report does not contemplate that this convention shall decide upon the details as to how we shall offer our good services, but shall leave that to the National Secretary and the National Executive Committee in conference with the State Secretary and the State Committee of Washington after this

convention is over. (Applause.)

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I move the adoption of that report. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report be adopted. Any remarks?

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I have no desire to stir up controversy, but because I have no desire to stir up controversy I believe in meeting this thing right here and now. Seven members of the National Executive Committee that could have given us something positive one way or the other, have come in here with a beautifully worded program and everybody gets the glad hand. It does not amount to shucks in Washington. I have been in Washington and I tell you that all that this action of the National Executive Committee does is simply to say that a fight is going on. I stand here to tell you, no matter what you do, I stand here to make a prophecy that if this convention adjourns without taking definite action one way or the other in the case of Washington, then inside of a month you will read in the party press of another row in Washington. We have got to deal with this situation. I have already been notified as to what will happen to me as National Organizer for what I said; that they have got my record from New Jersey. Well, I have faced the capitalists, and I am not afraid of a few Socialists that try those tricks. I challenge any National Organizer that has been in the State of Washington—

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: I rise to a point of order. I do not think Del. Goebel has been criticised, and there is no use wasting time on that.

DEL. GOEBEL: I knew you would raise that point.

THE CHAIRMAN: If a speaker wishes to waste his time let him waste it. Proceed.

DEL. SIMONS: Then I appeal from the decision of the chair, because such a ruling would wipe out all regularity.

DEL. GOEBEL: You need not decide the point, because I will try to keep within the bounds that he seems to want me to keep in. I am trying to make a point. I want to be distinctly understood that I am not

here favoring either faction, for I have got through absolutely with them. But I believe both sides have made mistakes. I believe both sides are absolutely honest. Both sides simply make the mistake of believing that some power above has ordained them masters to save the Socialist rank and file of Washington from being stolen by some crooked capitalist method. That being the case, both sides having made mistakes and properly having come here and stated that they are unable to settle these factional fights within the state, the controversy is for the national office to step in and adjust. If this convention should give a decision like that in Nebraska, and say, "We make no reflections on either side; we do not know who is wrong; we do not care to mix in this fight, but we do know that Washington is a magnificent possibility with some of the finest members in the ranks on both sides, and we want all to work together; therefore, in the interest of peace, we, the National Convention, step into Washington; we say to them that we are temporarily going to declare that State unorganized; we are going to send this to a vote of the rank and file in Washington to say who they want for State officers, and when that decision has been put on record we are going to stand with the crowd that has got a majority in the referendum." Is there anything wrong about that? My friends claim to be regular. I call your attention to this: read the State constitution of Washington. They think we have a democratic organization. In that State the State Secretary is not nominated by the rank and file. The State Committee is not nominated by the rank and file; it is nominated by a delegate body, a State convention. If I control the State Committee I will say whose delegates shall sit in the State Convention. If I control the State Convention I will nominate the candidates, and when I have nominated them I will say to the rank and file, "Vote for my nominees." That is the situation in Washington. Regular? Of course they are regular, but regular under those circumstances. You can do as you see fit, but you are simply putting off the day for this

national action, for the National Executive Committee to step in, not taking sides with either side, but saying to the rank and file who claim they have not been given a chance to say who is regular, that we will settle that; we will have a vote of that rank and file, and then make them stand by that vote of the rank and file. What did they tell us? They told us on this side that they have got 93 locals. If they have, they have got them in a hurry; they didn't have them when I was there. They say, "You have got a grievance." If I have got a grievance I challenge every other National Organizer that has gone to Washington in the last three years to stand up and tell whether my grievance is a personal grievance. They say they have 93 locals with a membership of 1400 or 1500. The other side claim a membership of 700. If that is the case, with 1500 on one side and 700 on the other, what have they to lose by a referendum? Nothing at all. That being the case, they themselves should consent to a referendum. They would lose none of their rights when the national officers were conducting that affair. They simply get their settlement direct instead of indirect. They say, "We don't want the stigma of being declared unorganized." We are not here for sentiment; we simply want to do the best we can, and the best way to do it is through the National Committee, so that both sides will feel that they have got a square deal. You take this case and I will show you local after local in Washington whose members are already completely disgrusted and say it is no use doing anything. All you have to do is to go to their State constitution, and that settles it. We believe in fair play; let us show it. They say they have 1500. All right; put the 1500 up against the other 700 and get a square count and see whether they have 1500.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I am in favor of the adoption of the report of the committee, for I could hardly see from the statement made by our National Executive Committee-member Work how they could do anything else. Then, besides, they say, "We have got a constitution." This demand that came to us—which I did not even oppose in the Nebraska case, but

I have got serious doubts about its judgment—of reorganizing every State and making threats to the conflicting factions, where will we stop? Let us pass a general resolution and reorganize, and we will be up in the air. We have got a wise provision of State autonomy. Even if you confined the controversy to the State where it exists you will prevent the party as a whole from getting mixed in it. In Washington it seems to me they have a fine lot of fish to fry. I do not admire much, either, the way they work it. Some of the people on either side I am perfectly disgusted with, but I feel willing to let that trouble stay in Washington; I do not want any of it in Illinois, and I do not believe anybody wants it settled except in their own State so that they can work harmoniously. I believe the report of the committee ought to be adopted and get over with it.

Now, as regards the National Organizers and their particular privilege about saying what is wanted, I am kind of long in the movement, and I will tell you that the force that tended to the disintegration of the S. L. P. was too much interference by National Organizers in local affairs. (Applause.) I was State Organizer in this State, and when a National Organizer came in he simply set you aside and he was the boss of the occasion. We want no more of that. Experience has taught us that we want to get away from that kind of game. I believe the report of the committee ought to be accepted as it is made.

DEL. JOSEPHINE R. COLE (Cal.): If you are going to have a democratic movement and at the same time have a centralized authority which will continually interfere with local affairs, you will have trouble. Comrades, you cannot settle local affairs by interference from national authority. If you settle it once it will break out again. We are told that the State of Washington has a constitution that is not democratic. Then I want to say to you that if the Socialists of Washington are not capable of taking hold of that situation themselves and framing a constitution that is in accordance with Socialist principles, you cannot make

one for them. (Applause.) Comrades, we might have the same thing happen in California tomorrow. If you are going to interfere with the organization it will tend to provoke a division. This proposition is offered for the sole purpose of having your National Committee interfere with the organization. Leave the local members to settle it for themselves. If a State has trouble let the State settle it themselves, but do not admit a state into your National organization unless it has a constitution in accordance with Socialist principles. See to it that it is admitted, and see to it that it is framed reasonably in accordance with the Socialist program. You cannot settle the affair. You simply throw Washington out. I thank you for your attention.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and Fellow Delegates: Comrade Goebel says, "I have been in Washington." So have I—longer than Comrade Goebel, and especially in the city of Seattle, which is the scene of this conflict. I am sorry to hear any delegate on this floor denounce either of these sides as a capitalist gang. (Applause.) Such a statement, and the fact that Comrade Goebel uses such terms, shows—

DEL. GOEBEL: I rise to a point of order, that I made no such point; that I purposely said both sides were honest, that they were afraid of a capitalist gang stealing them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.

DEL. LEWIS: I stand corrected. I apologize to Comrade Goebel for the misunderstanding. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All right; go ahead.

DEL. LEWIS: I left the State of Washington to come East, or to go South on my way East, because I could not agree to work with the present delegation, so that I am not prejudiced in their favor. But the first day I arrived in the State of Washington to work as a State lecturer for the regular State Committee, the protestants against the present delegation, before I had been in the State five hours, took me into a caucus and gave me to understand that the only condition upon which my work would be allowed to pro-

ceed at all in the State of Washington was that I should enter into an agreement with these same protestants to clean out the State office. (Applause.) And as a stranger I was expected to do that; and because I told them I had not come to Washington to enter into any local affairs or add to any existing disturbances, much less attempt to clean out a State office, these protestants did all they could to prevent my getting dates through the regular State organization, and more than once they shut me off the streets of Seattle and I had to spend my evenings idle when I was there for no other purpose than to propagate Socialism on the street corners. Another thing: I noticed in the headquarters at Seattle men who had their faces scratched up. I thought they had been in a cat fight; I thought they had fallen downstairs, or something, and I asked how these men came to have their faces scratched up. I discovered that the man who has traveled all the way from Washington to protest against this delegation, every time he had a dispute in the city headquarters with any member who would not agree to his proposal, the next thing he did was to scratch up his opponent's face with his finger nails, and the membership in Seattle state that they took it because they owed this man money and he told them that if they did not accept his motions and agree to his propositions he would demand his loan back and put the organization into bankruptcy. (Laughter.) Now, I only mention these things to give you an idea of the state of affairs in Washington.

Delegate Goebel says that if we do not do this there will be another fight in Washington. No matter what you do or do not do, there will be another fight in Washington (applause), and there will be fighting in Washington for years to come, and the best thing you can do in this convention is to keep your fingers out of it. (Applause.)

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): Comrades, I have listened to this debate with a good deal of amusement. I do not know whether it is vital to the decision of this question whether anybody

had his eyes scratched or not. I do not think the personal element, either the position of Comrade Goebel or the ideas of Comrade Lewis, amounts to anything. There is a fight in the State of Washington and there has got to be one more round. The question is, shall that round be left to the people of Washington to scrap back and forth through 49 rounds? (a voice, "yes") or shall we have one round under the control of the National organization, and get a final decision? The fact is that a fight is on. There is a certain kind of constitution in Washington which takes the rule of the party in Washington practically out of the hands and control of the local membership of that State, and that is absolutely contrary to every principle of party rule that we believe in. Now, shall we let that thing go on, or shall we say, "You shall take one referendum under the control of our National headquarters and settle it, and settle it at once, and those who want to stay out after that are out, and out for keeps so far as the National Socialist Party is concerned." Now, when a State convention arrogates to itself to nominate candidates for State offices and they think they are doing something that they have a right to do as in the State of Washington, some other people in some other State will be trying the same thing, and I believe it is time now, if Comrade Lewis does not want the same condition in Illinois, or if Comrade Cole does not want the same condition in California, to put a quietus upon the proposition right now.

The proposition is for us to decide, there is no question about it. The national party will have a finger in the pie, whether you will or not. We cannot have a question of that kind drag along endlessly, destroying the propaganda and the power of our comrades in Washington. I believe the question can be settled and settled right, and it will be settled right when they bring in a report that will settle every phase of the question. But a resolution deciding nothing would have no effect; it does not change the situation at all. That resolution is a good one. It is provided that there shall be a referendum from the Na-

tional office for the purpose of ending the State difficulty. It is proper in this case. The National office with far less reason declared the State of Nebraska unorganized, and now there is reason to declare Washington unorganized, when the condition is far much worse. I believe this motion of Comrade Lewis should not carry, and the National Executive Committee should forthwith issue a referendum to every Socialist in good standing in Washington and let the question be settled. I do not know why the comrades are opposed to a referendum vote. Is there any fear of the result? Don't we believe in it? Let them all vote, and when they have voted once it will come up again in the national councils.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I want to ask Comrade Miller if he has read the constitution of the State of Washington?

DEL. MILLER: I have.

DEL. BOOMER: We deny that it conflicts in any way with the National constitution.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): Comrades, I am an absolute stranger to both sides of this question, and I do not believe I have got to prove that statement. I have come to a certain conclusion on the basis of the arguments that I have listened to here on this floor. I knew very little indeed about the question until I heard the comrades on each side, and I am very much impressed with what the delegate that spoke last stated here. Both sides of the discussion admitted that there was something wrong with the situation in the State of Washington, and they both admitted, or claimed, rather, that what was wrong with the situation of the Socialist Party in the State of Washington is that a certain number of comrades or some member of a committee, or commission, if you please, has the power to determine the methods and manner in which questions are to be decided or voted upon or determined in that State. That is to say—

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): A point of order. No member from Washington has presented his case, and those are not the facts; there is no such power in the State of Washington.

DEL. FIELDMAN: It was stated on this floor that some sort of a committee had control of the Socialist Party of the State of Washington. It does seem to me that those who have come here with that charge should have armed themselves with their detailed facts. What is the law? I am anxious to hear that law, and on the basis of that it seems to me we ought to act. If it be true that in the Socialist Party of the State of Washington the membership has no power to control the acts of the whole party, that they cannot submit questions to a referendum vote whenever they see fit to do so, then it is up to us to settle that question. If it is possible for any number of members that are in a minority to absolutely control the will of the majority, or rather defeat the will of the majority in the State of Washington, then it is impossible to settle that fight in Washington unless the National organization takes charge of the question and submits the proposition to a referendum in that State under its control and thereby learns the opinion, the will and the desire of every member in the State of Washington of the Socialist Party. (Applause.) I submit, Mr. Chairman and delegates, that it is necessary that the opinion and desire of every member of the Socialist Party of the State of Washington be known before it is possible to settle this proposition. Now, if there be any one person here that has the law that is referred to, that it is claimed makes it impossible for the membership to govern the Socialist party in the State of Washington, I demand that that law be read here.

DEL. BROWN: We have it.

DEL. DAVIES (Pa.): Let us hear the law of Washington.

A DELEGATE: A question of personal privilege. Can't we have this read so as to save time?

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Hoehn has the floor.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill): A question of information. Will not Del. Hoehn permit this section of the law to be sent up to the secretary and read? I ask that it be sent up

and read, so as to avoid the chance of any comrades being mistaken.

DEL. HOEHN: Very well.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is fair.

A sheet containing the State constitution of the Socialist Party of Washington was sent to the secretary, and it was decided that the secretary should read it.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): I rise to move that the protestants be asked to read the passages, to point out the passages to which they object. There is absolutely no sense in asking a man who is absolutely unfamiliar with the constitution and the law to pick it out at a moment's notice. He either must read the whole thing and depend upon our picking out the passages as he reads, or we do not have any assurance that his selection will be the wise one. Now, the protestants make certain statements and charges. They contend that they have in that document a justification for their charges. It seems to me that the only logical thing is to call upon them to read the passages which they charge sustain their objection. Therefore I move that they be called upon to read the passages to which they make objection. (Seconded.)

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move to amend, that Delegate Goebel of New Jersey be requested to point them out. He is the one who made the charge here, and Delegate Miller of Nevada, and it is up to them to point out the passages in the constitution and not to ask outsiders.

DEL. SPARGO: We accept that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is accepted as the original motion. It is moved and seconded that Comrades Miller and Goebel point out the passages which they want read.

DEL. GOEBEL: Is this debatable?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is debatable.

DEL. GOEBEL: Then I want to suggest that those who ask me to do that know perfectly well that I can't do it right now, and that is why they ask me to, unless I am very much mistaken. Now, I want to make a fair proposition, as I see it. I have made a statement and I challenge those that I have named on the

Washington State delegation to deny it. Inside of twenty-four hours I have referred this very passage of the constitution to Comrade Boomer and Comrade Brown, and they have both admitted that I was right about the matter about the election of State officers, and both confessed they thought it was wrong. Both confessed to me it was wrong. Therefore they confess that what I have said is true. Even though I do not have a copy of the State constitution of Washington in my hand, I make this proposition. We have no interest in either side. We want to act for the best interests of the National Socialist Party. I suggest that instead of having further debate from Miller, myself or anybody, we allow the Washington delegates to name somebody to take ten minutes for them to put before you their side, and then allow the other side ten minutes, and having heard both sides, then settle it.

DEL. HILLOUT: I do not think we ought to take the position offered by Comrade Goebel. Delegate Goebel says he cannot point out the objectionable portion. I say that any delegate who is prepared to make a charge in open convention ought to be ready to point it out. (Applause.)

DEL. A. M. SIMONS: There is only one section there, and it will only take half a minute and it will be over with.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house, and your chairman can do nothing but put it.

DEL. STEDMAN: I ask now that that section be read as a point of information by the reading clerk. You always have a right to information before you vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct. Your motion is to read?

DEL. STEDMAN: I am not making a motion. I am asking for a point of information. A section has been referred to. I ask that the section referred to be read.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to read it. All in favor of reading say aye. Contrary. The ayes have it.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): This platform is in detached pieces, but I have it marked and I am going to read it. (Reading.) "Section 8. The State

committee shall elect a chairman, a secretary-treasurer and such other officers and assistants necessary to carry on the work of the State and translate the proceedings of the State organization into foreign languages if necessary. It shall employ _____ when it thinks advisable and call upon the membership, lecturers in organized States."

Section 17 refers to the same thing, the same offices.

A DELEGATE: Read it.

DEL. MILLER (reading): "The State Secretary-treasurer, Organizer or other assistants elected by the State Committee shall, for cause other than a party reason, be removed by said committee from office, subject to the same procedure." These two things are all I can find.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): What is the procedure?

DEL. MILLER: The same as in case of troubles and—

DEL. HERMAN: All right, we want to know what that is.

DEL. MILLER: Wait till I find it. DEL. KRAFT (N. J.): A point of information. Our delegates would like to know how the State Committee is elected.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I am in favor of the adoption of this report. I believe that the report is a splendid document and I also believe it is the duty of the National organization to build a fence as high as the Rocky Mountains around the State of Washington until they are through with their fighting.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): My voice is not in very good condition and you will do me a great favor by giving close attention. I am not going to keep you very long.

Under the present constitution the National Executive Committee could not make any different decision. It is queer also that those who opposed State autonomy so bitterly seven years ago are so very much in favor of it now. But since I am one of the originators of State autonomy that is rather flattering to me. It seems to me as we have it and it is working so well it ought to be kept up even if it does work a little injustice in individual cases. And so it does. Here is a case where about 700 Socialists

who would like to belong to the organization are kept out—and I don't know why. One crowd says the other crowd is bad and then the other crowd says these are bad people. I believe to some extent they are both right. (Laughter) I mean to say that they are both good and bad. I don't see any angel wings flapping on the delegation, when they rise as they have done. I could not help just telling my neighbor Hillquit that they knew the ropes, and when I heard the other man yesterday—he is a cook by trade and a good union man, and so forth—he has not learned the art of politics in any way, shape or manner. I thought if such a thing should happen in Chicago or New York it would be done on a different scale entirely.

A DELEGATE: Or even in Milwaukee.

DEL. BERGER: It seems to me that this is all we can do. It is all that we can do under the conditions. Their case is different from the case in Nebraska. In Nebraska there was not any party tangle; there was one man with whiskers, and one man with a mustache, and one with nothing. That was about all there was left of the party in Nebraska. They did not pay any dues or anything. On the other hand, those three men kept out about 150 Socialists. Of course we could not do anything else but declare the State disorganized, because it was a fact. The State had been disorganized. But there we have a strong organization—whatever you may say about that crowd, they know how. They have an organization of about 1500 members—

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): Two thousand.

DEL. BERGER: Be careful Brown, you only pay dues for 1500. They have an organization of 1500 and that has to be respected. In war and politics, as on the economic field, it is the real power that counts; nothing else counts. If they had only five or ten members we could have made very short work of it, but they are 1500 and you cannot do that. On the other hand, it would be a disgrace and a shame to the party if being 1500 of them they could not have sense enough and justice enough after they

cooled off a little to take in the other 700.

Why, comrades, as one of the members of the Executive Committee remarked, that is a good deal more than the entire Socialist Labor Party—larger than the entire Socialist Labor Party in the entire country. (Applause.) Give me all your attention and save your applause until I am through. There they have about 700 men fully as good Socialists as the others, and they are kept out—I don't know why. It is not like them, it is not like Krueger, it is not like Brown, although he is a lawyer, and as a rule I don't like lawyers, but they are all good fellows, but it seems to me they ought not to keep out so many hundreds of Socialists. If there is any possible way let us get them in. And that is why the National Executive Committee offered its good services to unite them. Of course I would not make a very good angel of peace. I am not supposed to be a very peaceful man as a rule. I never heard my own wings flapping very hard, but we can find some suitable man to go out there and unite them. Goebel is very much of my own make-up. He is a good effective organizer, but he is too decided in his opinions on a good many subjects, just the same as I am. So let us have somebody else, somebody who can unite both forces, both sides, in one strong body, so that instead of having 1500, you will have have not merely 2200, because the 700 will bring 2,000 more.

I move that you accept the report of the committee, but before you do so, in justice to both sides I would ask the comrades to hear the representative of the contestants. He has no horns and no hoofs. I have looked all over him. He has as good looking a face as I have seen anywhere, although I am not an Irishman. Give him a chance to be heard for ten minutes, and then the other side for ten minutes, and it will not hurt anybody. I say accept the report of the committee, that is, without any change.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would not our friends from Washington agree to that proposition to allow the representative from the one side to talk and then allow Washington to close the debate? Will they not consent to

that? I ask the question of the delegation through Comrade Brown.

DEL. BROWN: I ask permission to confer with the Washington delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a sensible proposition if they agree to it. All in favor of permitting a conference of the Washington delegation say aye. The ayes have it and the permission is given.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move that the previous question be ordered after the Washington comrades have presented their case.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion. Shall the previous question be put at that time? All in favor will say aye. The ayes have it and it is agreed to. You will understand that the two sides are to speak and then the previous question will be ordered and then there will be four speeches to bring the debate to a close.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I submit, Mr. Chairman, and delegates of this convention, that Washington has been hearing its affairs discussed, and Washington has not opened its mouth in its own defense. In justice to myself, in justice to the Socialist movement in Washington in its relation with the Socialist movement throughout the world, I now ask that Washington be given an opportunity before this convention to wash its own linen, and after your minds have been disillusioned of the charges that have been made, you can give us your cool, solid judgment, and Washington will always yield to the judgment of the Socialist party. But we want an opportunity to be heard in our own defense, and we ask that we be not shut off until we have had that full opportunity.

DEL. KRUEGER (Wash.): I second the motion.

DEL. MORGAN (Ill.): I move that the Washington delegation, this being a trouble in their own state, to place their whole case before the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much time?

A DELEGATE: Ten minutes.

DEL. MORGAN: I think they ought to have as much time as they deem necessary to place the facts before the convention.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move to

amend by making it twenty minutes for each side.

A DELEGATE: I second the motion. THE SECRETARY: It is moved that the Washington delegation have twenty minutes and that the other side have twenty minutes also. All in favor of the amendment will say aye. Those opposed, no. The amendment is carried. All in favor of the motion as amended will say aye. Those opposed, no. It is agreed to. The protesting side starts off. Who speaks for the other side?

COMRADE HUTCHESON: I wish to speak on that side.

DEL. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, a point of information. While Comrade Hutcheson is taking the platform I wish to ask if the Washington delegation will have twenty minutes and our accusers twenty minutes and then after the question has been put there will be two five minute speeches on each side?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct. COMRADE HUTCHESON: In the state of Washington there has been a controversy going on for a good many years. That controversy first started when Dr. Herman F. Titus entered the Socialist party. It has been going on ever since, but not so bitterly during the time that he left and took his paper from there and went to Caldwell; but after he came back again the old bitter fight was taken up and it is on now. There are certain things that we comrades who are on the outside of the party deem illegal there, and we think that we were illegally deprived of our rights to be members of the Socialist party.

Comrade Herman last night stated before the National Executive Committee that I was an undesirable, and should not be a member of the Socialist party, and they did not want me as a member of the Socialist party, and others he named there who are with us.

Now I want to state a few facts here to show why there is a contention that there is an illegality there in the state of Washington.

In 1906, about June or July, the unions and some others held a convention. It was called a union labor convention. A great many of our boys were anxious to see what the rank and file would do in a political convention. They went to the Labor Temple. When they got there they found they could not enter,

as an individual was standing there handing them cards on which was written "I, the undersigned, pledge myself to support the candidate or nominee, nominated at this convention," then giving the name, address, occupation and date. Well, they were stumped, but one of the boys said "Pshaw, I am going to write a fictitious name, a fictitious occupation, a fictitious address, and go in." So he did. Comrades Wagenknecht and Callihan brought charges against three of those members. We tried two of them and it was proved by Comrade Wagenknecht's own statement that when a division of the house was called for so they had to show who was taking part in the convention, these comrades—not only these three but some nine or ten or eleven others, got up and walked out of that convention, and showed in that way that they had not been taken into the convention.

The charges against the comrades were treason. We rendered a verdict that they had not committed treason. The only two votes against that were those of Comrades Callihan and Wagenknecht. Comrade Wagenknecht was the chairman of the local quorum. That is made up of five members of the state committee. And Comrade Wagenknecht took the decision up from the local to the local quorum, and there they had a resolution to revoke the charter of Local Seattle, and the state committee revoked the charter of Local Seattle by a vote of something like nine to six. There are fifteen members.

Prior to the revocation of the charter of Local Seattle Comrade Wagenknecht was a member of Local Seattle. He took a transfer of his membership from membership in Local Seattle, which was under charges, to membership at large. Two members of the local quorum denied him that right. Two members gave him that right; so there was a tie, and he as chairman voted himself a membership at large and thereby retained himself as a member of the Socialist party, giving himself the right as judge and jury to decide our fate. Now, there was nothing in the state constitution that deprived us of the rights of voting, and nothing in the national constitution, but there are passages there that state that any member in good standing shall have the right to vote on referendum. They did not deny Local Spokane—when they revoked the charter of Lo-

cal Spokane—the right to vote whether they should be put out, but when it came to Local Seattle, Local Seattle that had 388 members in good standing and some 500 or 600 more that would have been in good standing, they denied us the right to vote on whether or not the state committee should be sustained in revoking the charter.

They refused to send ballots to us. There was a referendum sent out asking that question of the rank and file, and the rank and file decided that we were to be deprived of that right. Another referendum was called as to whether or not Comrade Wagenknecht should hold the chairmanship of the Local Quorum, and transfer it to membership at large, and that they voted down, voting "No." There was another referendum as to whether or not Comrade Wagenknecht's action in the Local Quorum could be sustained or not; and it was not sustained.

Now, during this time some members of Local Seattle who were on the other side, Comrade Callihan and others, not Comrade Wagenknecht, because he was a member at large, they asked for a charter for a local in Seattle, pending the time when the rank and file should decide whether our charter was revoked or not. Two members of the Local Quorum gave them the right, and two voted against it, and Comrade Wagenknecht as chairman, and an interested party, gave them the charter. Then he transferred the membership to membership at large and he was a member in good standing as judge and jury in our case.

At the 1906 convention a resolution was passed stating that in the opinion of this convention all acts of the Local Quorum and of the State Committee where Wagenknecht voted and where his vote was a decided factor, were illegal and void. That was passed by referendum. I think they have it over there.

Now, when this question came up whether or not another charter could be granted to a local, a referendum was called on that and the rank and file decided it could not. Therefore, there did not exist a second local in the city of Seattle, but this referendum was counted the evening before the state convention. The next morning at nine o'clock the state convention convened.

Some time after the counting of these

referendum votes, between ten and eleven o'clock or possibly near twelve o'clock in the morning, after one member, J. C. Robbins, had left the Local Quorum, Comrade Wagenknecht and some others re-granted this charter to a few that were there and had by a resolution ratified the delegates that the organization had elected previously as the delegates to the state convention.

The next day at the State Convention, they, with the aid of the members at large, had a majority in the convention so that these members at large had full power there, and by that they organized the convention, elected their own credentials committee, seated themselves, and went to work to fix up the situation and everything there to suit themselves.

I will admit, comrades, that we have been easy. It takes a workingman a long time to learn some of these things and we have had against us Comrade Titus, one of the slickest parliamentarians, assisted by a few more like himself, that ever came down the pike. When there is a motion put before the house, they can bring up more points of order, more subsidiary resolutions, amendments, and amendments to the amendments, than you ever heard of. And we often didn't know where we were at.

But we have learned a good deal. We have graduated from that school. We have got to the point now where we cannot get into this party any more. By their acts, they say, that it is impossible for us to get back into the party. They state that I am undesirable and they don't want to have me in.

When one of the members of the National Executive Committee asked him if there weren't a good many of the seven hundred who were all right, he said he thought that some were, and then when he asked if the makeup of the seven hundred was any different from the makeup of their party, well, he said he couldn't say that they were.

Those who want an organization in the State of Washington not of 1,500, but of 4,000 or 5,000, or 6,000, we, who want to work with the Trades Unions and not against them, we are asking admission to the Socialist party. We want admission to the Socialist party, and that is what we are going to get, I don't care if it takes two or three or

four, or five, or even ten more years.

You can turn us down in this convention, and I will tell you, we will come back here four years from now, if we are not then in the party, fighting to get in again." (Applause.)

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I do not see why any man, or set of men who have fought themselves out of the Socialist party should not be able in the same manner to fight their way back into the Socialist party. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, with your kind attention—give your applause afterwards—every incident that Comrade Hutcherson has related to you happened long before the national constitution was amended so that the national body could step into the state of Washington and declare our state unorganized.

What are the facts there? He has talked about Titus. Titus is the one man in the state of Washington who has given his all, his health and everything, to the Socialist movement. I am not a friend of Titus, but I am a Socialist.

Now listen, comrades. The matters concerning Wagenknecht, and what he did, let us consider that. What was the condition of the Socialist party then? The Socialist party had something like 300 or 400 members. What was the condition then? Could anyone get in then? I say no and I live there. What is the condition of the Socialist party now? We have 1,500 members accounted for, dues-paying members. We have the widest organization, and the largest membership as compared to population of any state in the union.

What Comrade Herman said or what you can hear from them. They are here. You have not heard the evidence. You have heard declarations by the man interested in the final determination of this question. But the National Executive Committee has heard the evidence; they have scrutinized the evidence; they have passed judgment upon the case, and they were fully competent after hearing all the evidence and weighing it, to pass judgment on the case. And now for a man to come before this convention and make idle declarations—he does not tell you what the evidence is, but he wants you to pass upon those idle declarations in the absence of the absolute evidence. Well, gentlemen, I can't believe you will do it. (At this point a low whistle was

heard from one of the delegates.)
 DEL. BROWN: I accept that whistle, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perfect courtesy will injure no man's cause; so let us have it.

DEL. BROWN: The present Socialist Party of Seattle has never allowed at any time an election to go by—they have never at any time assembled in convention that the labor movement has not been always considered.

We had our headquarters in the Labor Temple of Seattle until one Walter Thomas Mills, by an intrigue, drove us from the Labor Temple; and Comrade Hutchesson was there, aiding and abetting that work. Then as soon as we were driven out of the Labor Temple in Seattle, Walter Thomas Mills took up his work in the Labor Temple of Seattle until the labor movement drove him out before he had given three lectures, and we had had that temple for months.

Five locals in the State of Washington made demand for a referendum, and mind what I tell you, we are not afraid of a referendum, although we don't care for a referendum every day before breakfast; but we are organized and the only reason we don't want at this time a referendum is because the fall campaign is coming on and we believe it will have the effect of disorganizing the grand work that these boys have done in the months of the past.

Those things that have passed, have passed. I tell you, if Washington is let alone, she will solve her own problem. The Socialist party of Washington is entitled to as good an organization as they are competent to get. And they are bound to have an organization, and the only organization that can do the work in Washington is the kind of organization they have there now.

Comrade Goebel made some remarks about the delegation from Washington, and I presume I was the target, but notwithstanding those declarations I want to say to you that we have been lined up and organized upon as straight, scientific, proletarian and Socialist lines as exist in the United States, or in the world.

Let us alone and we will wash our dirty linen and wash it clean.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I am not going to make an oration, and I hope you will clear your minds of all prejudice. This is not the place for prejudice. This is no place for hissing or whistling. If you are prejudiced you cannot think, and no Socialist should be prejudiced. Having prejudice, you cease to think scientifically, because no prejudiced man is able to consider anything scientifically.

Comrade Hutchesson claimed that we had an autocratic organization in Washington. The question whether we have an autocratic organization in Washington is not the question. The question is, does the rank and file rule? If the rank and file rule, then we have democratic rule, and you vote for us. If the rank and file does not rule, you vote against it.

Your national organization no more than two years ago had its National Secretary elected by the National Committee. Your National Committee, if I am not mistaken, elected the National Executive Committee, and that same principle we had in Washington with the exception that our State Committee is nominated by the State delegate convention. They nominated the State Committee and the names go to a State referendum vote. And these State committeemen are elected by a majority vote of the membership in the State of Washington.

I don't care what happened before 1907. We fight in Washington when we fight, and we take all the advantages we can. There is no use saying anything about it, to tell the truth. You have all had your scraps. You are not going to allow a man to draw a gun on you, if you can prevent it, and we do not fight that way in Washington.

In 1906 we had a love-feast. Hutchesson came in with us; they helped us. But after that they were again expelled. Expelled for what? Expelled for refusing to try one of their members for compromising. That is the reason. I claim in Washington that you are either for fusion or against fusion, and the two factions line up on that principle of tactics.

If you should decide in favor of Comrade Hutchesson, and that you

want him in your organization, you can have him, but we don't want him. Why don't we want him? We don't want anybody, and we don't want him, who is going around the State organizing locals against us. He went one place on the pretense of organizing a local of those who were expelled for voting the capitalist ticket. We don't want him."

A DELEGATE: He is undesirable, then?

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Certainly, he is undesirable. We do not ask you to listen to orations on this matter. We ask you to use your common sense. Comrade Miller is a good orator. Comrade Goebel is probably second to Comrade Miller, but the fact remains that they have made assertions where they have no proof. We make assertions which we can prove.

We have our State constitution and we know our State laws, and here is the question: If the Socialist Party of the United States is a party based upon the interest of the working class, if the Socialist Party of the United States is a party based on the class struggle, then the Socialist Party of the United States must follow the tactics and those tactics are anti-fusion and no compromise.

If the Socialist Party of the United States is that kind of a party, then this convention must vote with the National Executive Committee, because the regular party in Washington is anti-fusion and uncompromising.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): The change is made that the organization in Washington is not democratic and that our constitution is autocratic. They have not gone so far as to say that it is in conflict with the national party constitution.

I wish to say first that the constitution of the State of Washington was not drawn up to suit George H. Goebel, or Miller, or Nevada, or any other individual. The constitution of the Socialist Party of Washington was drawn up to suit the Socialist Party membership of the State of Washington. Goebel says that he does not like the state committee of the Socialist Party of Washington, and the state committee of the So-

cialist Party of Washington does not like George H. Goebel; and there are other members in the state of Washington, outside of the state committee, who do not like George H. Goebel, and the reason is that when George H. Goebel came into the state of Washington he wanted to instruct the state committee on what terms he should tour the state of Washington, and the state committee decided that they were the ones who had authority, and they would instruct George H. Goebel as to the terms under which he should tour the state of Washington, and the state committee of the Socialist Party of Washington went out as it always has done.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): If these statements are made about me I shall demand an opportunity to be heard in reply.

DEL. HERMAN: It is not a question of whether we have a perfect organization. We are not looking for a Moses. The wage workers of the state of Washington who are organized in the Socialist Party, and those who are in sympathy with the wage working class who are organized in the Socialist Party of Washington need no Moses to lead them out of the wilderness. We can take care of our own affairs. We do not need Herman F. Titus, or Walter Thomas Mills, neither—but in justice to Titus I want to say this: That no man who has been upon this platform can point out a single instance where Herman F. Titus has ever been disloyal to the Socialist Party or a traitor to the working class. That is all the distance I want to go in respect to Herman F. Titus.

However, we have to fight these people, this reform element, that is inside the Socialist Party, and we have fought them since the time that the Socialist Party was first organized in Washington. We have fought them and beaten them in every instance from 1900 up to 1907. In 1906 they were taken back into the organization, and it was through the influence of that so-called "Little Giant," Walter Thomas Mills, after he had extracted from the Propaganda Club, which was composed of expelled members of Local Seattle about a thousand dollars' worth of property, and then when they got into the Socialist Party the same Tribune Publishing Company, through the same agency, Hutchesson and other lieutenants, sold back the lit-

erature which had been collected out of the nickels and dimes of the working class of the city of Seattle, sold back to the party that literature which Mr. Mills got for nothing.

Now, this last time they thought they had somebody who could lead them to victory, but Walter Thomas Mills found that in the Socialist Party of Washington he was to meet his Waterloo, and that he could not introduce his reform ideas; and when he was expelled from Local Seattle, because Local Seattle refused to try him, it was then that this element went outside of the organization, and now, instead of fighting from the inside and trying to win there, they work from outside the organization and try to tear down what it has taken eight years to build up.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I don't want to take up my five minutes, but I do want to state the reason why I have aligned myself with the comrades of Washington who are in the state organization. Underneath all these arguments, underneath all these things that pertain to the individuals, if you look closely you will find that there lies underneath the question of fundamentals the question whether it shall be a working class movement or a middle class muddled movement.

I have not lived in Seattle for five years. I have been out of touch with the so-called Titus faction and the so-called Mills faction. I have been trying to run a Socialist newspaper in a strong Republican community. While I lived there we all had our little arguments occasionally, each comrade stating his conviction, yet the reason I stand with the comrades here is because the facts have come to my knowledge that the organization which now controls the party in the state of Washington is by far the safer, by far the more representative of the working class movement, than are the men who are the protestants here, those who represent the other side.

Mr. Hutcheson, who came down through the valley, seeking to organize locals, paper locals, so as to make a protest to the national committee, he came to our town, and in the presence of myself and my wife, who is a member of the local, gave us one of the reasons why he opposed the present organization in the state of Washington that he did not believe a state committee should have the power to revoke the charter of

a local, even though that local endorsed the Republican or Democratic ticket; and because of that I will fight bitterly to the end any faction, any individual, any so-called Socialist, who stands for any moment for such a proposition.

I have talked with those men on the other side, and I have found that they do not believe in the class struggle, do not believe in drawing the class line, and believed that it was all right, many of them, in case the Socialist Party had no ticket in the field, to vote for some "good man" on the capitalist tickets. Those are the kind of men who are trying to break into the Socialist movement in the state of Washington. We do not deny admittance to any man or any woman, no matter what their profession or trade, if they can prove to the satisfaction of those who have to vote upon them that they are not only Socialists, but understand what Socialism is.

I shall object as long as I have a voice to admitting Comrade Hutcheson or admitting any comrade who refuses to acknowledge the fundamentals laid down by the working class of the world in their conventions, and refuse absolutely to admit men who believe that a Socialist may still have a right to vote a capitalist ticket as it may suit their convenience.

In Prosser, Washington, some time ago we had the necessity forced upon us of crossing off the names of two members of the party because at the last city election at Prosser, despite the fact that every member was to write the word "Socialism" on the ticket, because we had no ticket in the field, two of the members deliberately voted for one of the capitalist candidates, and acknowledged that they had done it. We crossed their names off the local. Comrade Hutcheson protested against such automatic action on the part of Local Prosser and on the part of the members of the local.

It is because of these things that I stand where I do in the party organization of the state of Washington. It is a fundamental question, a question whether you want an organization there that stands for the wage worker, for the proletarian movement of the world, or whether you want an organization there that favors nothing that is fundamental, that pays attention to nothing except the matter of getting a large vote regardless of who they are or what they

know or believe about the movement.

That is the reason I stand with the Socialist organization of the state of Washington, because I believe that they represent the real, true working class expression in the Socialist movement in the state of Washington, and the others do not.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): I listened with great interest to the arguments on both sides of this question, and I was deeply interested in the statement by Comrade Hutcheson respecting the position that they occupied in the state of Washington; but I have concluded that the National Executive Committee have done the only thing possible in view of the conditions that exist, and in view of the statement by Comrade Hutcheson that he is going to break into the Socialist Party if it takes him ten years. That position is a mistake, for neither Comrade Hutcheson nor Comrade Mills can break into the Socialist Party if we and every member of the National Committee will remember that the time has come when we are not seeking to enhance our strength by all sorts of dickers and combinations, having men pass through the country organizing all the opposing factions, using all their power to destroy our recognized and organized locals, as has been done in this case and in the case of Comrade Mills in his tour through Canada.

The principle that is involved in this fight is the same principle that caused the expulsion of this comrade; it is the same principle of opportunism where people demand the right irrespective of their view or the limits of the movement of becoming political factors. I say that from what has been said upon this floor today there is nothing left to this convention but to endorse the action of the National Executive Committee and declare most emphatically that we, the Socialist Party of America, stand always for the class struggle, stand always for the Socialist movement, and the men who have given their lives, who have given their health, given everything they have in behalf of Socialism, have not watched it develop to the position which it now occupies for the mere purpose of turning it at this late date into a middle class bourgeois institution.

If an emphatic, clear declaration of the position of the Socialist Party is ever required, this is the time, this is the moment; and while we are gaining

strength, to all politicians and all aspiring individuals who find the ranks closed against them in the other political parties, whose hopes have been blasted in the capitalist political parties, and who think that the Socialist movement is a good vehicle to land them in the places they aspire to, we say no. The class struggle is the fight that we are making, and individuals count for very little. Dr. Titus may have been a great factor in Washington, Comrade Herman may have been a factor in Washington, but the only real interest we have in this matter is the matter of principle, the matter of policy, whether the Socialist movement is going to be served by allowing them to be brought into the party who should be out of it. Let us recognize clearly that under no condition, whether it be Washington or Wisconsin or New York—under no condition is there any place in the Socialist Party of America for that kind of opportunism; and let it be said further that when this declaration is made we make it in order to give the voters an opportunity to vote upon it if they want to.

DEL. GOEBEL: I wish to speak against the report.

DEL. WOODYBY (Cal.): A point of information. It has been charged that the parties on both sides are not Socialists. I want to know whether the parties in each combination signed the party pledge. I want to know whether they did or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: We cannot settle that question.

DEL. WOODYBY (Cal.): Unless we know that—

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we can settle that question. These members must sign an application.

DEL. BROWN: Anybody can sign an application.

DEL. WOODYBY: But, on the other side—I want to know whether both sides signed our application recognizing the class struggle.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer that. Delegate Goebel has the floor.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. Y.): I believe in state autonomy, and if you stand by the majority report state autonomy wins the victory, so I win either way; therefore, I am smiling.

I want to say a word or two on this matter. So far as I am personally concerned, I am going to say very little. Comrades sitting all over this hall know

Goebel, and whether he is simply hitting the high places or low places or fighting. National Secretary Barnes will tell you that I have an explicit understanding with him by which I could outline in some measure the line of work I was to do. I said to Barnes, "I am out to get in new locals. We can get them if you give me the chance." Barnes had the brains to give me the chance. He tried to get the state secretary to work with him. However, I got sixty-three—nothing to my credit—simply Barnes gave me the chance to work and get them in my own way. Two days before election Comrade Burgess, knowing I was coming in the state, although he knew I was coming months in advance, he kept me in suspense and then suddenly, two days before election, when he knew I was exhausted, he wrote me a list of dates when I was broken in voice and body, for the deliberate purpose of making it look as though I could not fill the requirements. They dared not turn down a man who was known all over the country as one of the best, so they had to find a subterfuge. Then I said, "This can't be done," and Barnes said I could rest fifteen days, and I wrote back a letter—it was not very sweet—my God, men, when a man has given the best he has, when he has given his life to the movement, why shouldn't he be nervous and irritable at times? I wrote the letter asking Burgess if there was anything against me personally, and if so, to write back and I would ask Barnes to put me in another state. He wrote back, "No, you are all right; I think you are one of the most effective organizers in this country, but you must know that we have got a scrap on, and we have got to be sure what side you are on; we have got to use caution as to the men sent by the national office, and they must use caution as to whether we ought to have them." I wrote back taking exception to this, and the dates were all canceled, and it looked then as though I wasn't good enough for Washington, in spite of a letter sent by Herman F. Tjus, addressed to Spokane and received by me, in which he says that he understands that I have no dates, and that if I am free they would be glad to have me tout the state of Washington under the auspices of the Socialists of Seattle, soliciting subscriptions for them, and speaking in their interest. You see, I was not good

enough to represent the national office, but I was good enough, if I would solicit subscriptions for a sheet that had the gall and nerve to abuse and publish a ridiculous attack upon men like Berger, men that had given their lives to this movement. If those people were capitalists and I was a capitalist's politician, and I wanted to reach those people for my purpose, I would say, "I believe in the class struggle; the other fellows are opportunists," and unless they look closely into the substance of it, it would get them.

This is the point I wish to make. It is not a question of Goebel; it is a question of the right thing. Both sides have proved themselves as able politicians as there are in the movement. You cannot deny that. Both of them have shown clearly that they will not stop at any method to win out. One side says, "Mills is the Moses"; the other side says, "Tjus is the Moses"; and then you have what in the state of Washington? You have got a lot of Socialists and you have them so absolutely confused and tired out and bewildered by the tactics of the few contending sects of Moseses, two leaders of strong personality, both able men, with able lieutenants surrounding them. Under all the circumstances I propose that you do not concur in this report, but declare the state unorganized, and thus at once give to these tired Socialists an opportunity to get their cards from the national office. That is my plan. They are tired of Moseses; they are tired of being saved; give the rank and file of Washington a chance to save themselves.

I know that the national office has no interest in this fight. All they want is to build up Socialism. Let them keep that state unorganized by taking action along this line, and that will mean that nearly all of the comrades will be in the Socialist movement and not engaged in a scrap.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I wish to speak in favor of the adoption of the report, because of the fact that there is no other possible way out of this middle in which we are at the present time. We cannot declare a state unorganized that is organized, and these comrades have a live, active, fighting organization in their state, on their side. We must admit that they are keen, shrewd and sharp, and sometimes unscrupulous in their tactics in the party. If they were to use those

same methods, that same shrewdness, that same activity, that same keenness that they have shown inside the party in fighting the capitalist class in Washington—they have sometimes, and I have watched them close—if they would use that altogether there, they would make a far more effective organization than they have today. Their organization is effective, and they have been very fortunate in some connections they have made. I agree with them that it is fortunate that Walter Thomas Mills is outside the Socialist Party. At the same time, because they have been able to do that, because they have had an opportunity to fight these men, they have built up what has become to a large extent a machine, which is used not simply against the capitalist class, but against men who are themselves Socialists. I don't know as to individuals. I don't know Comrade Hutchison. I know nothing but what these men told us, and the Executive Committee, that they could not tell any difference between the general rank and file of the organization. There is too much tendency to make soap-box speeches at all times, to appeal at all times and all places and on every question, even on a point of order, to the "fundamentals of the class struggle," in hope that they will get a hand, which sort of thing ultimately becomes pure demagoguery, no matter how sincere it is, and I think that the best thing that this convention can do is to let it go out to the party throughout the country, as it has gone out very plainly from our discussion here, that we believe that these fellows are good comrades, good fighters, but they are using rather strong methods, and that they would better go back to Washington and try to set their house in order themselves, try to recognize as I say that the eyes of the country are on some of the things that they are doing, and they would better get in accord with the rest of the movement. But we have got to keep our hands off officially. We have no business monkeying with that situation. We will do nothing to make it worse and if we try to do something—if we declare it unorganized, we declare a lie in the first place and we would simply make it disorganized, if we make that declaration. So I ask you to support the position of the Executive Committee.

A. DELGATE: I want to ask a question. In offering its services to one

of the factions, are we not recognizing one of the factions?

DEL. SIMONS: May I answer that? We do not offer our services to those who are outside the party. We offer our services to the comrades that are there who have a perfect right to reject them if they do not want them.

DEL. DAVIES (Pa.): I am opposed to accepting the report of your Executive Committee, or the recommendation of the National Executive Committee, for the reason that should we accept that report we put a gag on progress. There are lots of people who want to come in and further the cause of socialism, who want to push the movement, not necessarily keeping a clear line perhaps, but on the other hand there is an element here represented by Comrade Goebel of New Jersey, who want to have the Socialist movement in Washington progressed. On the other hand, there is another element here who want to try to hold the Socialist movement to a clear uncompromising class conscious—

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): A point of order: Under our rules, the different sides have to select their representatives, and this comrade, under the pretense of helping the contestants, is playing a shrewd trick. I stand for fair play and this is a trick.

THE CHAIRMAN: No one is entitled to the floor, unless he makes clear the side he speaks on.

DEL. BERGER: I want your decision. I think you stand for fair play.

THE CHAIRMAN: He is entitled to say his piece in his own way.

DEL. BERGER: If he is getting the floor by a trick, I say it is pretty rotten tactics.

A. DELGATE: I want to ask if he opposes the committee's report, and if he will vote against it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can't answer that.

DEL. BERGER: Let him answer it.

DEL. DAVIES: I will vote to accept the report of the committee.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Sit down. Get off the platform. Down, down.

DEL. VANDER PORTEN (N. Y.): I rise to a point of order, this comrade has no right to address the body.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are out of order.

DEL. HERMAN: We wanted to de-

bate this along the lines laid down. We do not ask for any advantage; we do not want any unfair support. We want somebody who is opposed to the adoption of the report of the committee to get up there and state his position.

DEL. WALDHORST: I am against the acceptance of the report as submitted. It is for this convention to declare that such tactics as have been pursued in the state of Washington during the last two years are not the right way to make good Socialists. It has been known to all the comrades, it has been in all the papers just what has been done there, and I think the National Executive Committee, instead of accepting that report, or making that report as it is, without any recommendation whatever to either side, that they did not do right, and the convention should not follow the same method. I think we should set our feet down on any proposition such as they have in their State constitution, which is not in the spirit of the International or National constitution. If we want to keep democracy, then we ought to carry it out in our own party first before we go out and ask anybody else to adopt it. If they don't want to carry out the initiative and referendum, and they have not denied a single thing that the comrade who was on the platform said—the comrade who spoke on the other side did not deny it—

DEL. BROWN: I deny it now.

DEL. WALDHORST: I am perfectly willing to concede that, but he has not denied the accusation that they did pursue the tactics that have been described here and they are not right. Both sides are to blame. I say let us do something that will settle once and for all any question that can come up in any state that will make it possible for any machine to be formed in the Socialist party, because if I despise anything it is a machine in this movement. If you want fair play give the rank and file fair play and you will get it. You won't have to be troubled about anyone else. I think that most of the comrades who have been in the movement as long as I have know very well what a machine is. I have been in it twenty-seven years, and I know what I am talking about. This is not the first time, I speak from personal experience, from what I have seen in the Socialist movement. I say it is about

time for this National Convention to step in there and say: "Here, boys, get straight before we will do anything more for you." I am not concerned in either one of them. You know as well as I do to defeat the report as it is. If they will amend it so as to make it mandatory on the National Executive Committee to get a referendum of the state of Washington, recognizing all as Socialists who will sign the Socialist plank of the party, I don't care what he is, or who he is, we will get the situation clear. The Nebraska situation would not have arisen if what I wish had been done in that case. So it will be in every state where the question may come up.

If this man, Walter Thomas Mills, goes into another state and gets hold of that state—he is a genius for organizing; he is a slick duck, I know him, I say, let him go into another state, and he will not be in that state very long before you will have the same proposition to face that you now have in that state of Washington. So I say, "Settle it now," settle it so that they cannot do any such thing as that, and then we shall be done with it. I think we have spent enough time on it now, but I think it will be a good thing if we spend a little more and get it right. (Cries of "Question, question.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is the question of the adoption of the report of the Executive Committee.

A DELEGATE: I move it be taken by roll call.

DEL. COHEN (Pa.): I rise to a question of the highest privilege—

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the question of privilege by the Delegate from Pennsylvania?

DEL. COHEN: The Pennsylvania delegation wish it distinctly understood that we opposed Comrade Davies doing what he did, and counselled him not to do it. We want fair play. And the rest of the Pennsylvania delegation desire to go on record as disavowing any part in the action of Comrade Davies.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is, on the motion that the vote be taken by roll call. Those in favor, say "aye." Those opposed, "No." The "ayes" have it, and the vote will be taken by roll call.

The roll call on the adoption of the

committee's report was then taken as follows:

Yes:—ALA., Freeman; ARK., Hogan; ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Bradford, McDevitt, Wheat, Truck Cole, Merrill, Osborne, Johns, McKee, Bauer, Starkweather; COLO., Bate, Floaten, Maynard, Miller; CONN., Smith; DEL., Henck; ILL., Collins, Benthall, Bertly, Brower, Fraenckel, Hunt, Knopfnagel, Lewis, Morgan, Kerr, M. W. Simons, A. M. Simons, Carr, Smith; IND., Strickland, Dunbar, Kunath; IA., Brown, Work, Shank; KANS., Wilson, Snyder, McAllister; KY., Seeds; LA., Hynes; ME., Pelsey; MD., Lewis, Toole; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock, Kontlow, D. White, E. White, Mahoney, Putney, D'Orsay, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Menton, Hittunen, Striton; MINN., Peach, Kaplan, Maattala, Thorsett, Nicemen, Ingalls, Williams, Anderson, Mack; MO., Garver, Hoehn, Brandt, Pope, Callery, Lipscomb; MONT., Graham, Hazlet, Westleder, Ambrose, Peura, Harvey, Powers; NEB., Porter; N. H., Wilkins, Arnstein; N. J., Killingbeck; RALLY; N. Y., Solomon, Wanhope, Hillquit, Lee, Lewis, Slobodin, Panitsch, Fieldman, Hunter, Hanford, Gerber, Furman, Vander Porten, Peiser, Spargo, Cole, Strebel, Klenke, N. C., Quantz, N. D., Lampman, Anderson; OHIO, Prevey, Cowan, Bandlow, Vautrin, Ziegler, Farrell, Devine; OKLA., Hagel, Branstetter, Ross, Davis, Branetter, Edwards, Dome, Block, Boylan, Wills, O'Hare; ORE., Varner, Ryan, Barzee, Crabtree; PENN., Adams,

Clark, J. E. Cohen, G. N. Cohen, Davies, Foley, Maurer, Moore, Ringer, Shlayton, Schwartz, Young; R. I., Hurst; TEX., McFadin, Bell, Payne, Buchanan, Rhodes; UTAH, Syphers, Leggett; VA., Dennett; WIS., Gaylord, Weber, Thomas, Melms, Berger, Thompson, Tuttle, Heath, Sandburg, Jacobs; WYO., O'Neill.

No:—ALA., Waldhrost; ARK., Perrin, Penrose, LeFevre, Snow; CAL., Woody; CONN., Schieldge; FLA., Pettigrew; IDAHO, Untermaun, Riggs, Chenoweth; IND., Reynolds; IA., Rohrer, Hills; KANS., Katterfeld; MICH., Lockwood; NEV., Miller; N. J., Goebel, Kearns, Kraft, Strobell; N. MEX., Metcalf; TEX., Smith, Thompson; VT., Wilson; W. VA., Houston; WYO., Groesbeck.

Not voting:—ARK., Jones; GA., Wilke; KANS., Brewer; N. Y., Furman; OHIO, Jones, Hayes; OKLA., Reynolds; S. DAK., Atwood, Knowles; TEX., Holman, Clark; WASH., Washington delegation not voting, being interested in the matter.

Absent:—MINN., Rose; MO., Behrens; ORE., Ramp; TENN., Voss.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is overwhelmingly in favor of accepting the committee's report. It is four or five to one. If there is no objection, I will announce now that the motion is carried to adopt the report of the Executive Committee relative to the matters in the state of Washington. Adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Shlayton called the convention to order at 2 o'clock.

The secretary submitted the report of the vote on the Washington case. The motion to approve the report of the National Executive Committee was carried by a vote of 164 for and 27 against. The next business being the voting for committees, it was decided that the voting be done by marking a cross before or after the name voted for.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.) moved to take a recess to enable the ballots on the committees to be gathered by

the tellers for the purpose of counting. The motion was seconded and carried and a recess was taken.

The convention was called to order at 2:30 P. M. ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: I have a telegram here. If there is no objection I will read it at this time.

"Baltimore, Md.
"Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall,
Chicago.

"Resolved, that Theodore Roosevelt be thanked for giving free and unsolicited

advertisement to Socialist propaganda.
"Baltimore Socialists."

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: Another telegram:
"New York, May 12, 1908.

"Chairman Socialist Party Convention, Brands Hall, Chicago:
"Russian American Social Democratic League sends brotherly greetings, and wishes successful work for the emancipation of labor."

A recess was taken for the counting of ballots.

The convention was called to order again about 5 P. M.

MESSAGE FROM COMRADE SARAH A. BIGELOW.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: While the comrades are being called from the ante rooms, I have a message to read to the comrades in this convention. It will take no time if we read it while the delegates are quietly taking their seats. Here is a message from the mother of George Bigelow. Mrs. Bigelow, widow of our comrade, George Bigelow, deceased, is with us today and sends us this message. I read it because you perhaps can best hear it. Comrade Mrs. Bigelow is at my right by the platform. The mother of George E. Bigelow, now over 80 years old, sends this message to this convention:

"It is my hope to live long enough to see the ultimate triumph of this cause, to which my only child gave the best years of his life. His great heart broke because of the pain of the world. My house is left unto me desolate, but all the world are my brothers and God will take care of me. Your comrade, Sarah A. Bigelow." (Cheers.)

DEL. SPARGO: I move that that letter be referred to the Resolutions Committee when it shall be declared elected, and that they be instructed to frame a suitable reply on behalf of this convention. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: I move to amend that instead of referring this to the Committee on Resolutions we send back a telegram and that we instruct our secretary to do so right away.

THE CHAIRMAN: It can be sent by messenger as she is in another part of the city.

The motion as amended was carried unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE ON COMMITTEES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary is ready to begin reading the reports on the delegates elected to the various committees.

The secretary then read the complete list of committees, which, after comrades elected to more than one committee had chosen which they would serve upon and the next highest had been substituted, were as follows:

Committee on Women and Their Relationship to the Socialist Party.—Mila Tupper Maynard, Antoinette Konikow, Gertrude B. Hunt, Winnie E. Branstetter, Josephine R. Cole, Laura B. Payne, Marguerite Prevey, Sol Fieldman, Grace D. Brewer.

Auditing Committee.—Mark Peiser, D. K. Young, W. L. Garver, W. W. Buchanan, George E. Boomer.

Committee on Constitution.—Winfield R. Gaylord, B. Berlyn, J. E. Snyder, Caleb Lipscomb, H. L. Slobodin, W. J. Bell, Kasper Bauer, A. G. Fenton, Fred Kraft.

Committee on Resolutions.—John Spargo, C. H. Kerr, Elizabeth H. Thomas, Edward Moore, J. C. Rhodes, Benjamin Wilson, M. Kaplan, Alfred Wagenknecht, Squire E. Putney.

Committee on Labor Organizations.—Algernon Lee, Robert Bandlow, Frank J. Weber, Grant Miller (Nev.), G. A. Hoehn, T. J. Morgan, James D. Graham, James H. Maurer, S. M. Reynolds, Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations.—U. Solomon, Antoinette Konikow, Louis Goaziou, Ester Nieminen, S. A. Knopfnagel.

Committee on Farmers' Program.—Carl D. Thompson, J. G. Willis, Seymour Stedman, E. L. Rigg, E. J. Rohrer, J. C. Thompson, C. W. Barzee.

Committee on Ways and Means.—G. W. Davis, F. L. Schwartz, W. M. Brandt, Charles Sandburg, Julius Gerber, Harriet D'Orsay, T. L. Bute, M. A. Smith, E. W. Perrin.

Committee on Press.—May Wood Simons, J. W. Slayton, W. A. Jacobs, Ida Crouch Hazlett, Ellis O. Jones.

Committee on Government by Commission.—(This committee was increased from five to seven.) John Hagel, Isaac Cowan, George Ambrose, Howard Tuttle, J. O. Bental, W. C. Hills, Gustave Strebel.

COMMUNICATION.

The following telegram was read:

"New York, May 12, 1908.—National Convention, Socialist Party, Brand's Hall, Chicago: The Executive Committee of the Jewish Bund in America sends its hearty congratulations to the National Convention of the Socialist Party of America. We express our earnest desire to see a powerful united Socialist Party in this classic land of capitalism. (Signed) Executive Committee, Jewish Bund of America." (Applause.)

PHOTOGRAPH OF DELEGATES.

An announcement was made that a photograph of the delegates would be taken in front of the Art Institute, Thursday morning, at 9 o'clock. (On account of rain Thursday morning, the photograph was not taken until Friday morning.)

The convention then, at 6 o'clock, adjourned for the day.

Secretary Barnes called the convention to order at 10 o'clock. Del. Stedman, of Illinois, was elected chairman for the day.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Des Moines, Iowa, May 13.—Socialist Party National Convention: Accept our congratulations, and we wish you great success in all your undertakings. (Signed) Branch Workers Circle, 107, Schenectady, N. Y., May 12.—National Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall: May your motives be undefiled, your battles magnificent, your conclusions unanimous and your achievements an inspiration. Yours for economic freedom, Local Schenectady. Chicago, May 11.—Socialist Convention, Brand's Hall: The Chicago organizations of the Jewish Socialist Territorial Labor Party of America greets the Socialist Convention and wishes it success in the future. (Signed) Jewish Socialist Territorial.

REPORTS.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I wish to announce that the report of Comrade Hillquit, Secretary to the International Socialist Bureau, and the report of Comrade Barnes, National Secretary, are formally noted in printed form. They appear on the desks.

The report of the International Secretary was then read, as follows:

Comrades:

The Socialist movement of the United States is an integral part of the larger movement for the emancipation of the working class of the world. Our party is organically and intimately connected with the Socialist parties of all civilized countries, and we have more than a mere sentimental interest in the fate and progress of our comrades abroad.

The struggles of international Socialism are our struggles, its victories are our victories and its defeats are our de-

FOURTH DAY'S SESSION

feats. It is, therefore, highly appropriate that this national gathering of American Socialists devote a few minutes of its time to a review of the progress and conditions of our movement beyond the boundaries of the United States.

And nothing can be more encouraging and inspiring to the militant Socialists of America than the contemplation of the wonderful development of international Socialism within the last few years.

THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM.

When we met in this hall just four years ago, the Socialist movement had already asserted itself as a factor of prime importance in the political life of several of the principal countries of Europe, and had taken root in almost all advanced countries of the world. The total number of Socialist voters was at that time estimated at about 6,500,000, and Socialism was represented in the parliaments of fifteen nations by a total delegation of about 250 deputies. But since then Socialism has made marvelous new gains and has grown all along the line. In France the divided Socialist movement has united into one harmonious and strong party; it has increased its vote by about 100,000 and has raised the number of its representatives in parliament from 37 to 54.

In England, the cradle of capitalism, the working classes, who have heretofore been considered impervious to Socialism, have within that period risen in powerful revolt against their exploiters, and have joined the ranks of the international Socialist proletariat. The British workmen have at this time 32 representatives of their class in the House of Commons, and two-thirds of these are Socialists. In Austria, where our comrades were largely instrumental in winning universal suffrage, the Socialist Democratic Party in the general elec-

tions of 1907 increased its vote from 780,000 to over 1,000,000, and the number of its deputies from 11 to 87.

But even greater victories than in France, England and Austria, Socialism has scored in that most unfortunate of all countries—Russia. In the vast empire of the Romanoffs, which for centuries has been succumbing to the yoke of an oppressive autocracy, all attempts of the "better classes" to save the country from the savage clutches of its rulers have been futile, and it has remained for the working class, the revolutionary, Socialist workmen of Russia, to strike the blow which is bound to set their country free. For, notwithstanding the momentary triumph of the reaction, the Russian revolution is not dead, and the Russian workmen who on January 22d, 1905, consecrated the soil of Free Russia with their blood, are more determined than ever, and they will rise again and again until the last battle between despotism and liberty will have been fought. During the short period of their relative political enfranchisement our Russian comrades elected over 90 deputies to the second Duma, and in the little autonomous dukedom of Finland the Socialists elected 80 deputies out of a total of 200, among them 9 Socialist women.

In Germany in the last general election the combined forces of capitalism and the government waged a campaign of unpremeditated ferocity against Social Democracy, and our German comrades lost 36 seats in parliament, but gained a quarter of a million votes.

All told, the international Socialist movement has increased in its voting strength since 1904 from about six million five hundred thousand to between nine million and ten million, and it has raised the number of its deputies in parliament from 250 to over 400. The Socialist movement counts its representatives in the various municipalities of Europe by the thousands, its press is reaching in all modern languages and reaches many millions of readers every day.

Socialism has spread to all countries of Europe, with the sole possible exception of Greece; to the United States, Canada, Argentina and Bolivia; to Australia, South Africa, to Japan and even China. "Charles V.," observed our eloquent comrade, Emile Vandervelde, at the Stuttgart Congress, "once said that

the sun does not set in his empire; we Socialists can assert with greater justice that within the countries in which the red banner waves the sun never sets."

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES.

The physical bond between the various movements of Socialism is represented by the International Socialist and Labor Congresses, to which all Socialist organizations and all other labor organizations which recognize the principle of class struggle and political action are admitted. The International Congresses discuss such questions of Socialist principles and methods as are of importance to the movement in all countries, but their resolutions are advisory rather than directive or mandatory.

The Socialist movement of every nation had originally an equal vote in these international councils, but in 1907 these votes were apportioned among the various affiliated parties in accordance with their strength and numbers on a graded scale of 2 to 20.

The Socialists of the United States, in accordance with that plan, were given 14 votes at the last congress.

The first of the new series of these international Socialist conventions was held in Paris in 1889, and it was followed by six more as follows: Brussels, 1891; Zurich, 1893; London, 1896; Paris, 1900; Amsterdam, 1904, and Stuttgart, 1907. And as the Socialist movement grew and extended steadily during that period, so did each succeeding congress excel its predecessors in point of representation and general strength. The first Paris congress was attended by 391 delegates (221 of them Frenchmen), representing 17 countries of Europe and the United States; the Stuttgart congress was attended by about 1,000 delegates, representing 25 distinct countries of all parts of the world.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU.

At the London Congress of 1896 it was resolved to try the experiment of establishing a permanent International Socialist Bureau with a responsible secretary, but the practical realization of the plan was left to the succeeding congress of 1900, which definitely created the bureau and prescribed its functions. The International Socialist Bureau is composed of two representatives of the organized Socialist movement in each

affiliated country. Its headquarters are located in Brussels, Belgium, and are in charge of a permanent secretary. The bureau is the executive committee of the international congresses, and meets at such times as its business requires. In the intervals between its sessions it transacts its business by correspondence.

During the experimental period of its existence the International Socialist Bureau seemed to hold out but scant promise of accomplishing practical results for the Socialist movement, and the delegates who attended our last national convention will remember the rather pessimistic report of our party's representative on the bureau on that occasion. But within the last few years, and especially since the appointment of its present and gifted secretary, Comrade Camille Huysmans, the International Socialist Bureau has readily adapted itself to the needs of the movement, and to-day it is a useful and important factor in the Socialist movement of the world. It secures and publishes from time to time valuable information on the progress and conditions of the Socialist and labor movements of all countries; it advises on matters of Socialist legislative activity and it organizes the international congresses. The bureau has established an archive of the socialist movement and has collected a library of socialist works, both of which are of the utmost importance to the students of socialism, and finally the Bureau has often served as a medium for mutual assistance between the socialist and labor movements of the different countries. During the period of intense revolutionary activity in Russia, the Socialists of that country received through the Bureau over 150,000 francs.

THE PART OF THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST.
The first representative of the Socialist Party of the United States on the International Socialist Bureau was Comrade George D. Herron, who resigned on account of ill health in the early part of 1905. Since that time I have had the honor to serve on the Bureau as the representative of our party. For obvious reasons I have been unable to participate in the sessions of the Bureau between conventions, but I have always been in active correspondence with its secretary, and have endeavored to the best of my ability to keep the socialists of America posted on the developments of our movement abroad and vice versa. I have also taken part in all sessions of

the Bureau held in conjunction with the conventions of Amsterdam and Stuttgart, and have attended the plenary meetings of the conventions. The reports of these conventions have been submitted to you and need not be recapitulated here.

The delegates of our party have on both occasions performed their duties faithfully and capably, and have earned the respect of their comrades abroad.

Let us now endeavor to invest the socialist movement of the United States with that power and importance to which it is entitled in view of the advanced industrial conditions of our country and the needs of our proletariat, so that we may soon equal, if not eclipse, the glorious achievements of our brothers on the other side of the Atlantic.

Fraternally submitted,

MORRIS HILLOUT.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure with the report?

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman, I move that the report be adopted by the convention, with a recommendation to our party press that they give it the widest possible publicity. (Seconded.)

DEL. KEARNS (N. Y.): I move as an amendment that it be made a part of our propaganda material and that it be printed in pamphlet form by the national office. (Seconded.)

DEL. SPARGO: I am willing to accept that.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I wish to move a further amendment, that in line 14 on the second page the word "women" be inserted after the word "workingmen." Farther down the word "women" is used in connection with the subject of nine deputies having been elected to the congress of Finland. In this particular instance I wish to amend it to read: "All attempts of the 'better classes' to save the country from the savage clutches of its rulers have been futile, and it has remained for the working class, the revolutionary, Socialist workingmen and women." (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe that will be accepted by the secretary.

DEL. HILLOUT: That is acceptable.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Are you ready for the amendment to the amendment?

DEL. WANHOPE (N. Y.): I have just one suggestion to make. The par-

NATIONAL SECRETARY'S REPORT.

agraph at the end of the second page states that Socialism has invaded every country in Europe with the exception of Greece. I am glad to state that I know for a fact that Socialism has invaded Greece. (Applause.) There was in the last paper I published a report from a local in Greece, which says it has 500 members. (Applause.) I move to add that as an amendment. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have three amendments. The comrade moves to amend the amendment by another amendment, but adding Greece.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I want to say, in behalf of Socialism in Greece, that the Socialists of New York have borrowed their present official emblem, the arm and the torch, from the Socialists of Greece.

DEL. HILLOUT: I desire to say that I have absolutely no objection to the annexation of Greece. (Applause.) The point of the matter is that Greece is not connected with the International Bureau, and the movement in Greece is not as yet a political factor. I am glad to hear from Comrade Wanhope that the last reports are that there is a strong local somewhere in Greece. I have no doubt whatever but in a short time the Socialist movement in Greece, as well as anywhere else, will be a very important factor, and I have, as I stated, absolutely no objection to taking out that exception.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on Greece? (Question called for.) All in favor of including it will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. The ayes have it and it is so ordered. We now come to the amendment that it be published and circulated as a leaflet.

DEL. SPARGO: The mover of the original motion, asking that it be given wide publicity in the party press, accepted the amendment suggested by Del. Slayton. They are not mutually exclusive and can be included.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then everything is practically embodied in the report; it has all been accepted. Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) All in favor will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no. It is carried.

Asst. Sec. Strickland then read the report of the National Secretary, as follows:

PORT.

"Comrades: Since you last assembled in national convention, four comprehensive annual reports, one by Comrade William Manly, ex-National Secretary, and three by the present incumbent, dealing with the conduct of the national office and containing a review of the acts of all national party committees and national party referendums, have been published and circulated among the membership, the latest dated Jan. 10 last and covering the calendar year 1907. With the subjects thus of record and readily accessible I shall not occupy your time.

"The constitution has been amended by national party referendums in the following particulars. The National Executive Committee and National Committee shall meet when deemed necessary in place of at stated periods of three months for the former and even years, other than the presidential campaigning years for the latter. The National Executive Committee and National Secretary are now elected by national party referendum instead of, as formerly, by the National Committee. All amendments to the constitution proposed by the convention are now required to be submitted to the referendum, and in case of a controversy arising in any state as to the validity of the title of its officers, under certain conditions, a referendum is to be conducted by the National Executive Committee.

"The National Committee has elected a committee on platform and a committee on constitution, and the results of their consideration and their recommendations are at your disposal.

"The provision of the constitution authorizing the election, in advance, by the National Committee of a committee on rules and order of business, has served its purpose by expediting, to some extent, the business of the convention.

"Section 2 of Article 2 of the constitution reads as follows:

"Any person occupying a position, honorary or remunerative, by the gift of any other political party (civil service positions excepted), shall not be eligible to membership in the Socialist Party."

"The membership qualification therein noted is a bulwark. It stamps our

organization as a thing apart and distinct from all other political parties. Wherever this issue has been raised and the party's position has been maintained it has been a source of strength, and elicited the further confidence of the working class, already nauseated by the vacillating policy and trucking character of reform movements.

"Section 3 of Article 12 of the constitution reads as follows:

"The platform of the Socialist Party shall be the supreme declaration of the party, and all state and municipal platforms shall conform thereto; and no state or local organization shall under any circumstances fuse, combine or compromise with any other political party or organization, or refrain from making nominations, in order to favor the candidate of such other organizations, nor shall any candidate of the Socialist Party accept any nomination or endorsement from any other party or political organization."

"In this connection the fact is pointed out that there is no related section or provision in the constitution for the enforcement of the declarations set forth. 'Anti-fusion' resolutions and rules for procedure were adopted by the National Committee in session in St. Louis, Mo., Jan. 31, 1903, and the National Committee again on May 15, 1905, recurred to the subject. I recommend that the sense of these resolutions or some other provision covering the same purpose, be incorporated in the organic law."

"National Committee motion No. 16, adopted Oct. 22, 1907, and which provided for agitation against the Dick Military Law, was not carried out in the matter of printing a leaflet containing the law and propaganda matter bearing on the subject; for the reason that the advance orders did not warrant the expense. However, the purpose of the motion did not fail, for numerous meetings were held. The subject was presented by active party members, to many labor unions and other organizations. The Socialist press gave it considerable attention and prominence, and the supply of this document in the war department at Washington has been exhausted by application from all parts of the nation."

"National Committee motion No. 32, adopted Jan. 14, provided for the issuance of a leaflet upon the crisis. This leaflet was not printed for the same rea-

son before mentioned, and the further fact that while the motion was pending a number of leaflets dealing with the same subject appeared in the principal cities, the product of party locals, and the report of the secretary to the International Socialist Bureau, Comrade Hillquit, with this as a text, was published about the same time.

"Motions by the National Committee have provided for the issuance of 'A Campaign Hand Book for the Impending National Election' and 'The publication of a leaflet showing Injunctions and Court Decisions against Organized Labor during the past two years.' Both of these documents are in course of preparation. Comrade Joseph M. Patterson kindly consented upon request to take charge of the former and Comrade Seymour Siedman of the latter."

THE NEBRASKA CONTROVERSY.

"That which is generally known as the 'Nebraska Controversy' occupied considerable space in the official records and was the subject of six motions by the National Executive Committee, besides occupying the major portion of two sessions of said committee, and resulted in eight National Committee motions. Regarding this subject, I direct your attention to a recital of the facts in the case taken from all the documents then in hand and published in the October issue of the official 'Monthly Bulletin.' This statement has not been assailed by either side to the contrary."

"Based upon Section 9 of Article 12 of the constitution, the amendment to the constitution last adopted, a petition, with upwards of 700 signatures of residents of the state of Washington and addressed to the National Executive Committee is on file in the National office. The petition questions the validity of the title of the officers of that state organization and requests the National Executive Committee to conduct a referendum of the membership of the state upon this subject."

"The apportionment for delegates in the last convention was based upon one delegate for every one hundred party members. One hundred and eighty-four delegates were in attendance. The apportionment for the representation in the present convention is based upon one delegate for every two hundred

party members. The accredited number of delegates is 219.

"The question of a delegate for Local Honolulu, Hawaii, was referred to the National Executive Committee. I am pleased to report that while the subject was pending Local Honolulu, out of consideration for the expense upon the National party, decided not to send a delegate, and transmitted their views in a communication which has been referred to the proper committee."

"The party progress recently noted in New Mexico, North Carolina and Nevada, if continued, should, in the near future, result in taking them out of the unorganized column and provide them a place in the sisterhood of organized states."

"Aside from Hawaii, before mentioned, we have locals or members at large in Alaska, South America, Mexico, the South Sea Islands, the Panama Canal Zone and the Philippines."

"Standing today as we do upon the threshold of a great national campaign, fruitful as never before of opportunities for the working class, there is no small degree of satisfaction in noting the fact that every political time server or representative of capitalism stands trembling with fear for the preservation of the ancient privileges of the possessing class. This is cumulative evidence of our growing strength. A scared enemy is a battle half won."

"At the beginning of the last presidential campaign year, our membership numbered less than 16,000. Today our records and roll contain more than 41,000 members, while 830 new outposts in the form of party locals have been established in as many cities, hamlets and towns, making a total, not counting the numerous branches in large cities, of 2,470 locals attached to the National organization."

"The efforts of the enemy to misrepresent, hamper our growth and suppress Socialism, the signal failure of these efforts and our present party status, heralds the fact to all the world save those blinded by prejudice, that the American political division of the international working class army is a permanent establishment, a self-reliant and indestructible organization groomed for certain victory."

SUMMARY OF THE FINANCES.

"Balance due National Office for dues stamps:

Alabama	...	\$ 23.20	Montana	...	38.70
California	...	70.10	Minnesota	...	1.75
Colorado	...	50.15	Nebraska	...	26.25
Florida	...	19.95	N. Dakota	...	1.25
Illinois	...	150.00	Oklahoma	...	158.50
Kentucky	...	2.55	Rhode Isl'd.	...	10.00
Louisiana	...	5.40			
Massachusetts	...	47.16			\$604.96

"It should be understood that these accounts appeared during the time that the National Office granted dues stamps on credit. The total amount outstanding at the end of the year 1904 was \$1,147.88, and, in fact, it was larger at the time of the adoption of the National Committee motion, which took effect Feb. 1, 1904, and provided that orders for dues stamps should be honored only when accompanied by cash. The provisions of this motion since its adoption have been observed and carried out."

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

"The National Secretary's financial statement from Jan. 1 to May 8, 1908, inclusive, is as follows:

Receipts.		
Balance on hand Jan. 1,	\$ 565.47	
January	2,187.03	
February	3,447.46	
March	3,650.23	
April	6,413.59	
May (8th, inc.)	2,650.25	
		\$18,914.03
Expenditures.		
January	\$2,034.67	
February	2,932.96	
March	2,330.35	
April	1,988.40	
May	1,651.08	
		\$10,937.46
Balance on hand May 8,	\$7,976.57	
Outstanding accounts	604.96	
Total balance	\$ 8,581.53	
Liabilities	516.26	
Total cash resources,	\$ 8,065.27	

SPECIAL ASSESSMENT STAMPS.

"A statement of special assessment stamps up to and including May 8, is as follows:

Alabama	\$ 27.45
Alaska	1.00
Arkansas	164.45
California	497.70
Colorado	195.65
Connecticut	92.00
Delaware	7.00
Florida	42.40
Georgia	16.45
Idaho	156.80
Illinois	412.70
Indiana	114.75
Iowa	191.80
Kansas	200.90
Kentucky	26.60
Louisiana	43.40
Maine	35.25
Maryland	12.60
Massachusetts	153.65
Michigan	193.80
Minnesota	330.95
Missouri	364.00
Montana	125.00
Nebraska	40.60
Nevada	40.60
New Hampshire	39.55
New Jersey	369.60
New Mexico	31.80
New York	300.00
North Carolina	19.25
North Dakota	54.60
Ohio	304.50
Oklahoma	615.65
Oregon	185.00
Pennsylvania	269.50
Rhode Island	66.00
South Dakota	76.30
Tennessee	29.75
Texas	344.25
Utah	50.00
Vermont	9.10
Virginia	11.90
Washington	225.00
West Virginia	51.10
Wisconsin	457.55
Wyoming	134.05
Members at large	11.10
	\$7,143.05

TO PAY DELEGATES' FARE.

"The special assessments to pay the railroad fare of delegates to the National Convention is provided for in the constitution. By National Committee

motion the amount of the assessment and the period within which it should be collected was decided. 'A part of the motion reads as follows: 'Stamps are to be sold to state organizations or locals and members at large in unorganized states on credit, the state organization, etc., to return all stamps not used in levying the assessment and to be responsible for, and pay for all stamps not returned.'

"Owing to the prevailing general condition of unemployment it was believed at an early date to be impossible to meet the entire liabilities on this account by the sale of the assessment stamps, and a supplementary National Committee motion, providing for collection to be taken by each local to assist in paying the mileage expenses, was adopted on April 21. At this late day there appeared no practicable method to secure results other than by direct communication with the locals from the National Office. This course was pursued, and at the same time an explanation was made to the state secretaries and their concurrence in the plan requested. Within the few days intervening between the issuance of the call and the closing of this report the receipts on this account were \$191.16, a most gratifying showing.

"In preparation for the campaign data regarding speakers and literature wanted has been gathered from the locals, while no set plan has been decided upon, the material in hand will be a valuable guide in mapping out the general plan of campaign.

"The National Finnish Translator, Comrade Watta, will present a report, and his recommendations relating to the conduct of that office I heartily indorse. For the very important subject of the relations of the foreign speaking organizations with the national party I bespeak your earnest and serious consideration.

"For the right of free speech and a free press our party is generally recognized as holding the vanguard position, battling for their maintenance. The disfranchisement of a large number of the working class by the operation of state primary laws is a closely related question, and a plan should be devised or a policy decided upon for the systematic handling of both these questions. "I take pleasure in expressing my

heartily appreciation of the valuable assistance and co-operation rendered by Comrades W. W. Rihl, Franklin H. Slick, Marguerite Flaherty, Bertha Cap-pels, Chas. Drees and James H. Brower, who assisted for a longer or shorter period in discharging the various duties devolving upon the office of the National Secretary.

"Into your hands, comrade delegates, is committed the greatest trust ever reposed in any body by the conscious members of the working class of this continent. Their hopes, their aspirations, rest with you. Under present-day conditions a working class political party is a necessity. The Socialist Party is that party. Under any, under all conditions, a vote for capitalism indorses its every crime. Our aim, the abolition of wage slavery, the human race emancipated. In the words of another, 'Our children will surely see it, and we, too, if our faith and works deserve it.'

"Fraternally submitted,
"J. MAHLON BARNES,
"National Secretary."

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your pleasure with the report?

DEL. SHANK (Iowa): I move you, now that the report has been read, that it be submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means. (Seconded.)

DEL. MAHONEY (Mass.): I move the adoption of the report of the National Secretary. (Seconded.)

DEL. KLENKE (N. Y.): I move, as a substitute for the whole, that the report of the National Secretary be received and the matter pertaining to the Nebraska controversy be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means; that on finance to the Auditing Committee; that referring to the foreign speaking organizations to the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations, and the matter referring to free speech, etc., to the Committee on Resolutions. (Seconded.)

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): The constitution matters should be referred to the Committee on Constitution.

DEL. KLENKE: I accept that in addition to my motion.

The substitute was carried.

DELEGATES' MILEAGE.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I wish to announce that at adjournment, by applying

at the national office the delegates can get the cash coming for railroad allowances. The assessments did not provide for sleeping car accommodations—some have charged for these and others have not—and I would like to be instructed in regard to such an account.

A DELEGATE: I should like to inquire of the Secretary if there will be a surplus in the fund.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I shall be able to announce definite figures by the close of this afternoon's session. But I can say now—and it is the most gratifying fact I could announce, I believe—that there are more funds on hand than the liabilities will amount to.

DEL. MAHONEY (Mass.): To bring that before the house in regard to the sleeping car accommodations I would move you, Comrade Chairman, that the delegates be paid their railroad fares at the rate of first-class fares, and that does not include sleeping car accommodation.

The motion was duly seconded by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the delegates be paid their railroad fares on the basis of first-class tickets.

DEL. BROWN (Wash.): I would like to ask when he said "first-class fares," if that does not shut out the excursion fares.

A DELEGATE: It should be not exceeding a first-class ticket.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I desire the information whether the motion just made contemplates that delegates who have to travel two or three days or even twenty-four hours, are supposed to stay up at night and not sleep?

A DELEGATE: In the interests of the movement, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish the delegates would offer amendments to the motion rather than speaking to the motion under guise of asking for points of information.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I move to amend that the railroad fares to be paid the delegates shall include necessary expenses of a sleeping berth.

The amendment was duly seconded.

DEL. FARRELL (O.): I suggest that Comrade Hillquit add to his amendment that the secretary be instructed to use whatever surplus there

may be over and above first-class fares for the expenses of sleeping berths.

DEL. RYAN (Ore.): I believe we have come as far as any of the delegates in this convention, and we are opposed to allowing the sleeping berth to any delegate. We slept in our chairs or paid for our sleeping berth in addition, and if there should be any funds left in the treasury it won't hurt the treasury and we can use it in sending out speakers. Therefore I am in favor of paying only the actual mileage expenses of the delegates and keeping the balance in the treasury for employing our organizers throughout the United States.

DEL. COLE (Cal.): The reason the Socialists pay the fare of the delegates is in order that the poorest men and women in the country can come to the convention if they are chosen, and there is many a man and woman among us who might represent the party well who feel the burden of this extra sleeping berth, and our extra hotel fare in Chicago, as something very heavy; and there are many who will not come for that reason. It is in the interest of democracy that we pay these fares. What right have you if the money has been voted expressly for the purpose of helping the delegates—what right have you to divert that fund for any other purpose, the fund that was collected in the locals—in our local we took up a special collection to help out the delegates—and not for speakers.

DEL. SCHWARTZ (Pa.): I would be in favor of paying for the sleeping car berths provided there were sufficient money to go round for all the delegates. The chances are that there will not be enough for all the delegates, and a poor man who is a working class representative will be satisfied to sleep in the seat.

DEL. ROSS (Okla.): I want to say to this convention that Oklahoma has a delegation of twelve. Oklahoma has paid six hundred and fifteen dollars and some odd cents for special due stamps which the constitution says shall pay the delegates' carfare to and from this convention. We did not have any sleepers and we do not want any money to pay for sleepers; and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the only man who has asked for it is from the largest

delegation and that delegation has not paid half as much as Oklahoma.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I admire the spunk of our comrades. The Washington delegation has come a little farther than the Oregon delegation. We met the Oregon delegation and the old farmers and their wives have slept in their seats from Portland, Oregon, to Chicago, Illinois. I say that the constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, and when the constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, it does not mean that you shall buy yourself a two dollar or a three dollar berth in a Pullman; and when the constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, it does not mean that you shall spend even one dollar a night for sleeping accommodations. Now, if sleeping accommodations are to be paid for, I should think every comrade would have the right—every comrade who slept in his seat, no matter how far—should have the right to be paid for the inconvenience he has been put to in sleeping in his seat. It is no fun to be waked up two or three times in the night by the conductor looking at your tickets, or to be waked up twenty times by passengers getting off or getting on, or by the conductor asking you to divide your seat with a man who has just got on. The constitution is clear on this subject. The constitution says that railroad fares only shall be paid, and how can you vote to pay for berths when by voting so you vote to violate the constitution?

DEL. DENNETT (Va.): I want to ask this convention of Socialists whether they think the working class money should be spent for palace car accommodations. We have paid for those stamps in Virginia, and whatever surplus there is should go into the national funds for propaganda purposes. I move that the surplus over railroad fares be appropriated for the propaganda of the Socialist movement.

DEL. PEISER (N. Y.): A point of information.

Cries of "Question."

DEL. PEISER: I want to know whether New York did not pay more than three hundred dollars.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: Not until the close of the report on the eighth, and I think not since.

A DELEGATE (Cal.): A point of information. I wish to know from the secretary if California has not paid more than \$497.

The original motion was carried.

PARTIAL REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): The Resolutions Committee is ready at this time to make only a partial report, but do so for the sake of expediting the business of the convention. There was referred to our committee by a very slender majority of one, ninety-three to ninety-two, the proposed telegram which was read to the convention, and which has been before you in the papers, to be sent to the Western Federation of Miners, and the Resolutions Committee in going over that proposed telegram recommend that it be sent to the Western Federation of Miners, as proposed by Delegate Miller, without any alteration. On behalf of the committee I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor will say Aye; opposed, No. It is carried unanimously.

BILLS AND ORDINANCES.

DEL. SPARGO: I have this resolution to offer: "Whereas, It is essential that all bills and ordinances introduced by Socialists before all legislative bodies should be accessible to all Socialists throughout the country to aid them in constructive legislation, therefore, be it resolved that we recommend to the National Executive Committee that it make provisions to have and keep on file all bills and ordinances introduced by Socialists in legislative assemblies, and furnish copies thereof on request at cost."

I move the adoption of that resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

A DELEGATE: I wish to amend by making it read that provision shall be made by the Executive Committee to furnish copies to each state secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any one can get it under that resolution.

THE DELEGATE: I mean that it shall be the duty to forward it to the state secretary.

DEL. SPARGO: The committee responds to that by saying that it is re-

garded as a somewhat inefficient procedure and that the state secretaries are not always the best persons to have them and it is better to lay down the definite principle that any member of the party who is interested will know exactly where he can get the copies of the documents.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the resolution as read will signify it by saying Aye. All opposed, No. The ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted.

STATE AND LOCAL CANDIDATES.

DEL. SPARGO: A resolution: "Whereas, It is essential that the full strength of the Socialist Party should at an early date be actively organized for the impending campaign, and to effectively perfect its organization it is essential that the state and local candidates should be nominated at an early date; therefore, Be it resolved that it is the sense of this convention, and it hereby recommends, that the state and local organizations nominate as speedily as possible all state and local candidates."

I so move.

The motion was duly seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor will say Aye. Opposed, No. It is carried unanimously.

LETTER TO PRESIDENT OF U. S.

DEL. SPARGO: At the first session of the convention there was submitted as a matter of personal privilege by Delegate Hoehn of Missouri an open letter to the Chief Magistrate of the country, Theodore Roosevelt. It was proposed by Delegate Hoehn that this convention should depart from its ordinary business to send such a letter to President Roosevelt. As it was neither a matter of personal privilege nor a matter of urgency it was, as we think, properly ruled out at that time by the chairman of that session. Now that open letter so proposed has been submitted to the Committee on Resolutions and we have considered the matter carefully. It is a voluminous statement which, in our judgment, if read at this convention so as to become a part of our proceedings would subject our whole Socialist movement to great ridicule. Therefore, we ask, in

view of the absolutely impossible nature of this document, sending a statement to the President of the United States which would make a laughing stock of this convention and of the party which we represent, the Committee on Resolutions ask that it be killed without even being read to the convention.

DELEGATES: No. Read it.

A DELEGATE: No star chamber.

DEL. SPARGO: The committee also wishes to say that leave to withdraw the document is at the disposition of the gentlemen who submitted it, and I say frankly that in my experience I have never read such an absolutely preposterous statement as this document which I hold in my hand.

DELEGATES: Read it.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): In the first place, I did not insist that the committee should bring in a favorable report. I handed this document to the chairman of this committee with the request to look it over and told him that it was the document that was not permitted by the chairman at the first session of the convention. But since the chairman of the committee has made such a decided statement, and since the committee has not seen fit to even ask me to appear before the committee and present my side, and since the committee had the matter in its hand perhaps only an hour or so, I now insist that the document be read to the convention, and therefore move that the document be now read to the convention.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I second the motion. I don't believe in setting a precedent here and taking away from the comrades anything until they have an opportunity to know what it is. I don't believe in any autocratic business of any kind in a Socialist convention. Nor do I believe in the judgment of any committee being set above the judgment of this body. I want at least to have the letter read—you need not be afraid of us.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): In common justice to the delegate from Missouri I insist on this matter being taken out of the hands of the Committee on Resolutions and put in the hands of a special committee. It is not in the province of the chairman of any committee appointed by this convention to bring such statements on this floor without giving the man chiefly interested a chance to

be heard. It would be undemocratic and unsocialistic; and I am opposed to that sort of procedure.

DEL. TUTTLE: It is already out of the hands of that committee, and on the floor; and we don't want it to go to another committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Upon the request of any delegate any paper before the house may be read.

DEL. BRANDT (Mo.): It ought to be read.

THE CHAIRMAN: The request has been made and if it is insisted upon, it will be read.

Cries of "Read it!"

DEL. BRANDT: It is necessary to read the document.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chairman of the committee has risen to read the document.

A DELEGATE: I move to lay this whole matter on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Spargo has the floor to read.

DEL. SPARGO: Let me preface the reading by this statement. The Committee on Resolutions had the power presumably to keep the matter entirely from the convention. The Committee on Resolutions decided that it was not an autocratic body. It expresses its opinion to the convention, and although you have the right to have it read if you wish, the committee recommended that it should not thus be made a part of our proceedings. If you rule otherwise and say that you don't agree with that, the committee is perfectly willing to have the matter read before the convention.

DEL. BROWER: I rise for information. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if the statement of the delegate from Missouri is true that he was not even asked to appear before the committee when the committee was making its decision?

DEL. SPARGO: The statement that he was not asked to appear before the committee is partly true—it was no discourtesy to the delegate from Missouri, but due to the demand from the convention that you have some kind of a report from the committee.

DEL. TUTTLE: I wish to move an amendment.

DEL. HOLMAN: There is a motion before the house to read that document. That motion was duly second-

ed. Until that motion is put and carried the document ought not to be read. Don't read it if you want to carry out parliamentary law.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is hardly a point of order. You are merely instructing the chairman.

DEL. SPARGO: The proposed letter is as follows:

To President Theodore Roosevelt, White House, Washington, D. C.

"Every far-sighted patriot should protest first of all against the growth in this country of that evil thing which is called class consciousness. The demagogue, the foolish Socialist visionary, who strives to arouse this feeling of class consciousness in our working people, does a foul and evil thing."

(From President Roosevelt's Special Message to Congress.

Sir:—

In your latest special message to Congress you raise the question of class consciousness. As the highest executive officer of this great American republic you appeal to every far-sighted patriot to protest first of all against the growth in this country of that evil thing which is called class consciousness.

As the president of this republic, occupying the most responsible political position by the will and consent of the majority of the voters of the country, you have consciously or unconsciously instilled hundreds of thousands of law-abiding and patriotic men and women by charging them with the perpetration of foul and evil acts, because they are educating the working people in class consciousness.

Mr. President of this great republic, we beg leave to inform you that you have committed an act of gross injustice to the millions of Socialist citizens, to every Socialist man and woman in this and other countries, and we insist that you owe them a public apology. Even as undesirable citizens, we have the right to demand that whenever you address Congress in a special message on any vital problem of the day you should first properly inform yourself on the subject, in order that you may know what you are talking about.

We Socialist delegates in National Convention assembled take great pride in pleading guilty to the charge of arousing the class consciousness of the

working people. We feel proud to plead guilty for the same reason that Patrick Henry, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and other heroes of the great American Revolution felt proud of their consciousness of American independence from the feudal reign of King George.

Mr. President of the Republic, kindly permit this national convention of "undesirable citizens" to call your attention to the fact that unless the Socialists succeed in educating the working class of this country to a consciousness of their conditions, to a consciousness of their common interest, to a consciousness of the necessity of class conscious co-operation on the political battle field, this country will be thrown into a state of capitalist despotism and anarchy.

You, as the president of this republic, know from your every-day experience that the class rule of capitalism is supreme in the United States Congress, in the United States Senate, and even in the United States Supreme Court; you, as president of this great republic, are acquainted with the fact that our United States Congress has become a mere political clearing house of capitalist class interests. Every just and reasonable demand of organized labor for protective labor legislation has been opposed by the capitalist class and this class-opposition found expression in both houses of Congress. The very fact that even the leading conservative labor unions connected with the American Federation of Labor have been forced into the political arena is the most striking proof of the existence of class rule, class government, and class justice.

This capitalist class rule is dictated by capital class interest. Out of these conflicting class interests develops the class struggle between capital and the forces of organized labor.

That this class struggle is not a theory but a real, hard fact, a condition which must be met, you, as president of this republic, have repeatedly pointed out in your official messages to Congress and in your public addresses and speeches. We, the Socialists, are doing no more than you do. We simply attest the existence of the class struggle between capitalism and the working class, but we go one step farther and tell the working class that only by class conscious action will it be able to bring

about a change in these conditions. Every day the working people are growing more class conscious because they are getting more educated.

Mr. President, does it not occur to you that the man or woman who is not class conscious must be unconscious of the real conditions under which his or her own class of people are suffering? To be conscious of the condition means to know the condition. To be unconscious means not to know the conditions, nor the ways and means to change them.

You, Mr. President, repeatedly demanded from Congress laws for the benefit of the people, but your demands were ignored because the capitalist class interests dominated the law-makers. You know that the United States Congress has become the cemetery for labor legislation. If in place of the political undertakers there were seated in the halls of Congress fifty or one hundred class conscious workmen and Socialists, every demand for labor legislation made today by you or by organized labor would be enacted into law and no United States Supreme Court would dare to disregard the will of the nation. By your latest message to Congress, that is, by raising your Don Quixote warning against class consciousness, you have done more towards spreading class consciousness in the ranks of labor than we could accomplish in many, many months of agitation and propaganda.

In order that you may not again show your lack of knowledge on such a vital question as class consciousness, and that you may not repeat your insult to the "undesirable citizens," we hereby instruct our National Secretary, J. Mahlon Barnes, to mail to your address, together with this open letter, a copy of the Communist Manifesto, by Karl Marx, which we hope that you will carefully read, so that you may convince yourself of the fact that even the President of the United States may sometimes be wrong.

Respectfully yours,
SOCIALIST PARTY NATIONAL
CONVENTION.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this letter be laid upon the table.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

DEL. HILLS (Iowa): I want to make the point of order that the chairman has no right to recognize the chairman of any committee that is making a report until he first submits the question to the convention, and asks them what their pleasure is; and he has permitted the chairman of the committee on resolutions to make a motion before submitting it to the convention, and I want that point of order decided.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order will be sustained; there is no motion before the house.

DEL. REYNOLDS (Ind.): It seems to me it is time that a letter of this character emanating from the class conscious workers of America should not be designated as preposterous.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any motion—

DEL. REYNOLDS: I move that this letter be adopted by the convention; that it be ordered printed by the National Office, and a copy of it transmitted to the President of the United States, with the Communist Manifesto.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Comrade Reynolds and seconded by Comrade Tuttle that the letter be printed and a copy be sent to the president.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I am opposed to this motion. When we undertake to print and disseminate throughout this country a statement coming from this convention it ought at least to conform to the A, B, C of the Socialist philosophy. I don't propose to go into any extended criticism; but just take one or two points as samples of the rest. Here is a passage that occurs in this document: "The class struggle between capitalism and the working class." Since when did capitalism become a class? The capitalist class is a class, but "capitalism" is not the name of any class. This is the kind of language that with an A, B, C knowledge of the Communist Manifesto referred to in this document would have been impossible. But this occurs again and again. "The class struggle between capitalism and the forces of organized labor." State-ments of this description do no credit to the delegate from Missouri who presents them.

I object further to this convention

referring in terms of adulation to men like George Washington, and referring to the bourgeois revolution of 1776 as if it were an ideal presented on the floor of this convention of what we wish in the future as a Socialist revolution.

When we send any statement to the president of this country, to be disseminated, as it naturally would be, through the press of America, it should at least be carefully revised, and it should be written by scholars, at any rate, who will not confuse a state of society with a class.

Let me develop that point. In the city of San Francisco, as the delegates from California know, we had trouble on this very point. We had a speaker on our platform who refused to recognize the class struggle—and if this document does not deal with the class struggle, what does it deal with?—we had to instruct him—at least this was the decision we arrived at—to instruct him to recognize the class struggle in his speeches, or get off the platform. I know, of course, that that was a foolish way to deal with such a question. In order to comply with those instructions he explicitly said, "I believe in the class struggle, not between the capitalist class and the working class, but between capitalism and the working class," a piece of subterfuge, inane, meaningless, but to have that subterfuge and that inanity transplanted to this document and then sent out as a statement by nearly three hundred of the alleged picked intelligence of the Socialist movement of America would disgrace this assembly.

DEL. HOEHN: I shall not attempt to enter a debate with the previous speaker as to the meaning of capitalism and the class struggle. But just take this fine point that is made about capitalism and the working class, or the class struggle between labor and capitalism—take any Socialist paper and in almost every issue you will read about this struggle of organized labor against capitalism. Now, all at once we find that some great professor of the English language, or some great professor of philosophy, informs us all about capitalism, and the fine difference between capitalism and the capitalist class.

He has not made a single remark as to the substantial merits of the document. If the document can be improved in language I have no objection to that.

I have never been fool enough to believe that whatever I say is the best that can be done. But I don't care if I were the only one in this hall today who would stand up for this document, I would not mind it, and I would stand up for it.

DEL. SHANK (Iowa): A point of order. The comrade is not using good grammar.

DEL. HOEHN: The point of order is well taken.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I would request that all the delegates accord Delegate Hoehn the privilege of stating his case without interruption. Those interruptions are not fair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade understands the situation, I think.

DEL. HOEHN: I hope you will pay as close attention to me as you did to the people who have the monopoly of fine language. It is not always the man with the fine language who makes the revolution, mind you. It is the great rank and file who are out on the battle field that have to do the fighting, that make the revolution. It is not always the great philosopher of socialism who knows most about the class struggle. He may think he knows. But it is the great rank and file who are out on the battle field that have to fight the class struggle; and they know a little about it, too.

I challenge each and every delegate on the floor of this convention to show me where there is a single sentence in that document that is not true.

DEL. LEWIS: I will tell you.

A DELEGATE: I will answer that. SEVERAL DELEGATES: I'll tell you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hoehn has the floor.

DEL. HOEHN: I challenge you to show me a single sentence or statement in that document that is not a fact.

The first fact is that the Socialist movement of America has been insulted by the President of the United States. When he says that the class conscious Socialists of this country are committing foul acts I say it is an insult. And if these great philosophers will stand such insults I shall protest against it. The trouble is there are some people here who are afraid to come out and tell the facts in plain language as they are.

Only a few minutes ago you sent a telegram to the Western Federation of Miners. That telegram contained a protest against sending the federal troops to Alaska. Those federal troops were sent to Alaska for the purpose, the express purpose, of breaking up the Western Federation of Miners. But who sent the troops to Alaska? It was President Roosevelt. And that same man did a foul act against the Socialist movement of America when he claimed that the class conscious workmen are committing foul acts by advocating the developing of class consciousness.

I say to you: Do as you please with this document. I believe in every line that is contained in it. I shall stand for it, I shall vote for it, and it matters not how many of you may vote with me.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I want it understood why I seconded that motion. I stated to you that I did not want it tabled. I wanted discussion upon it, and when I got up to second that I did so in order that we might have discussion upon it, and then vote intelligently.

I am not in favor of going out after every yellow dog and labeling it and saying: "He is not a Socialist." I am not in favor of dividing our efforts and going off and hitting this man here and the president there; but I want this matter discussed here, and I reserve the right after we are through to vote it down if I want to do so, even though I seconded it.

I seconded that motion to bring out all the points for and against it. I heard those things that were said there about George Washington, and the fathers of our country, Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine, and I am not at all bothered by any of those things. I understand this movement. You need not be at all worried about it. I understand it perhaps as well as any man upon this floor, and I am not worried about any of those things.

I thought when I seconded this motion that you would be able to vote intelligently after discussion, and I think you will be able to do so by the time you get through, because I see there are a lot of you who are going to explain it all to us.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): I am opposed to the motion. I think that the committee, if it had wanted a fight on

this matter, could not have taken more pains to get that discussion than they did in the way they presented their report.

I am not in favor of this convention sending any communications whatever in the name of the Socialist Party of America to Theodore Roosevelt. The convention, if it sent a resolution or letter to Theodore Roosevelt, would simply vitalize the dirty, pusillanimous statement that we are "undesirable citizens" engaged in "foul work" when we struggle to lift the great labor class into the dignity and full expression of democracy.

I am opposed to the motion and any expression going out of this convention to Theodore Roosevelt, but I want it understood that no committee reporting to this convention in the future will bring in such a statement regarding any matter before it, without giving the man or woman who offered the resolution, or whatever the subject matter of the report is, an opportunity to be heard. And if the committee has a doubt as to whether or not the matter should be brought before the convention they shall hesitate before they make such statements as have been made here.

DEL. WINNIE E. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): It seems to me that the spirit of this letter is—well, I am not sure whether it is the spirit of earnestness or the spirit of sarcasm. If it is the spirit of sarcasm, then I say the Socialist Party of the United States is not in any position to consider any question of sarcasm. If, however, it is written in the spirit of an earnest endeavor to educate Theodore Roosevelt, then I say it is entirely out of order, and that we are gathered here for a great deal more important purpose than the education of any one man in the United States.

The document is a very good document, but it has no place in this Socialist convention. If we desire to send a manifesto or an open letter to Theodore Roosevelt, then I submit that a committee of this convention, or the convention itself in committee of the whole or in the proper parliamentary manner, is fully capable of formulating such a manifesto and sending it forth. We do not need any document that has been prepared previously to the meeting of this convention. We are entirely capable of doing those things right here dur-

ing the eight or ten days we will be here.

I have nothing against the comrade from Missouri, and am rather prompted to admire the revolutionary spirit that prompted the writing of that letter, but the comrade has simply made a mistake in putting it before this Socialist convention. It would look beautiful printed in some of our propaganda papers, or possibly in a pamphlet, but we do not want it to go forth from the Socialist Convention to bring ridicule upon the convention and upon the Socialist Party.

DEL. FRAENCKEL (Ill.): I want to say that President Roosevelt is the first president of this country that has had the spunk, or courage enough, to come out and say what he thinks about the Socialists. All the other presidents have had a tendency to hide somewhere and were afraid to tackle us. We must at least give Roosevelt the credit of coming out and not being afraid to say what he wishes to say.

I am in favor of doing something with

this document. We have arrived at the point where we must decide. Shall we assume the policy of the other side? Shall we take up the pamphlet to public discussion? Now I do not know whether it would be the best policy to answer him or not. But I do know that something must be done. I know that we must answer one way or the other.

President Roosevelt has invented a new word—"undesirables"—and he may invent another new word, and I don't want a new word to go by default. We need new words. We need new expressions. I believe something should be done along the line of sending him a letter of another description—something where we might have the chance to reach him first, and he might not be able to coin a new word about us. So I believe this letter should be sent. I believe that letter should be sent just as quick as we can reach him, because by the time the convention is over we shall not be able to reach him.

(Adjourned until 2 P. M.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The convention reconvened at 2 o'clock.

COMMUNICATIONS.

"Kemmerer, Wyo.

"W. L. Mead, care Socialist Headquarters, Chicago, Ill.

"Citizens' ticket 79, and Socialist, 50.

(Signed) "A. P. Roberts, Secretary."

"Dr. Antoinette Konikow, Delegate to Socialist National Convention, Brand's Hall.

"Socialist Women's Society, Branch 6, Elizabeth, send their heartiest wishes to National Convention of the Socialist Party at Chicago."

"Waterbury, Conn. Convention, Erie and North Clark Sts., Chicago.

"Congratulations to convention of Socialist Party. Hurrah for unity!"

"National Convention Socialist Party, Brand's Hall.

"The Chicago Lettish Social Democratic Society sends hearty greetings to National Convention and hopes that the comrades will spend some time considering the immigration question, so important to Socialists from foreign lands."

"Chairman Socialist Convention.

"Comrades, greeting. We profess to believe in the equality of the sexes. Let us make good by giving a woman a place on the ticket. Yours for revolution, Camille Kixley."

"Socialist Convention.

"Scandinavian Karl Marx Club, Chicago, in meeting assembled at first anniversary, sends greeting to your convention, wishing you great success in your valuable work for the freedom of the working class.

(Signed) "W. P. E. Ilsen."

LETTER TO PRESIDENT OF U. S.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will proceed to the discussion of the motion before the house. I would like to say this, that it has been suggested during the noon hour by several delegations that there are some states that have not been heard from at all. After recognizing two, if you ask for the floor I shall try to recognize those from different delegations first, until we cover those from the different delegations. I will try not to recognize two from one delegation unless it is the sense of the house to do otherwise.

DEL. FELDMAN (N. Y.): Mr. Chairman and Comrades, when the chairman of the Resolution Committee stated that this letter was preposterous and therefore ought not to be brought before this convention I really thought that it would be wasting our time in giving it any consideration, because I have known Comrade Spargo for a long time and I have always found him very clear in almost everything that I have known him to be connected with. But I do believe that in this case Comrade Spargo did make a mistake. Particularly was he mistaken when he labeled this document as a preposterous document. Even though there are grammatical errors in this document—and there are, and I believe that the writer admits it, he admitted that to us—yet that is no proof that the document as a whole is preposterous or that it is not deserving of careful consideration.

It has been stated on this floor by a number of speakers that this convention ought not to address itself to Theodore Roosevelt. I want to call your attention to the fact that all through the world the revolutionary movement does address itself, both singly, that is, through its subdivisions, and collectively, to the official heads of the various countries that they find themselves in. Some of the very finest means of agitation in Russia are documents that are addressed to the czar personally by the revolutionists of Russia. (Applause.) That is not only because as they are drawn up they speak from the hearts of the bleeding working class of Russia, but because they speak to a man whose name attached to a document causes universal attention. Now, what is true of the czar of Russia is true of Theodore

Roosevelt in this country. (Applause.) Theodore Roosevelt, in the attack that he has made upon class consciousness and the Socialist movement, the labor movement in general, addressed himself not only to the Congress of the United States, but to the United States, the people as a whole of this country, and therefore we that believe we represent the interests of the working class of America are justified and it is necessary that we should address ourselves to the official head of the United States. (Applause.) My dear comrades, the time has come in this country when it is absolutely and unqualifiedly necessary that the Socialist movement should point out to the working class of this country that still believe in the Terrible Teddy and are still swayed by him or any other official in this country—that we should point out to them once and for all time that even though a man is president of the United States, yet he is not above speaking from ignorance on a question of such importance as Socialism. We know that Theodore Roosevelt, in the speeches he makes, in the messages that he addresses to Congress, discusses Socialism not as a man who has given it thought, not as a man who has given it ample consideration, even though it be a biased consideration, but as a man that has given it no thought at all, that has not investigated the question, not even from the A, B, C point of view. It is up to us, the convention of the Socialist Party of America, to point out to the working class and to the people of the United States that the President of the United States is ignorant about Socialism (applause), and that he attacks it not only because he is opposed to it from class interest, but because he does not know what he is talking about, and we have got to meet him. (Applause.) Therefore, Mr. Chairman and comrades, I am in favor of electing a special committee; that that committee might be charged with this manifesto or document or whatever you wish to call it, but of substituting it with something better if they can get one up that is better. (Applause.) But let us not neglect this. Anything that we as a convention address to the president of the United States will command the attention of every reading

man and woman in the United States. (Applause.) And therefore it is very necessary that we should carefully, in a dignified spirit and style, if you please, draw up a clear statement of what we stand for, address that statement to the President of the United States, and serve notice upon him that we are not responsible for his ignorance and that we are not going to overlook it. (Applause.) Such a document coming from the convention of the Socialist Party of America and addressed to the President of the United States will command more attention than any book or pamphlet that is now in existence. (Applause.) And it is for this reason that we should take this action.

The platform of the party commands attention, and it is an open letter to every man, woman and child in the United States. But inasmuch as the President of the United States has attacked us and is attacking the working class, and he does it ignorantly, it is up to the working class to take up the gauntlet and make him eat his own words. (Applause.) Comrades, Theodore Roosevelt as a person, as an individual, does not deserve our collective attention. But Theodore Roosevelt as the President of the United States does command and should command our attention. (Applause.)

Have we not addressed ourselves to the president before? There is not a local in the Socialist Party of America that has not adopted resolutions that were addressed to Theodore Roosevelt as a man and President of the United States. There is not a single local in the Socialist Party of America that is not eager to make the president realize the responsibility of his position as President of the United States. We have done it in the Haywood case, and we are ready to do it and should do it in this case. (Applause.) Therefore, comrades, let us act wisely on this question. Let us get up a document that is above criticism so far as grammatical errors are concerned. Let us get up a document that shall fully and clearly state the position of the Socialist Party and the Socialist movement of the world and the position of the working class, and then say to the president, "Here is our position. Now tell us what you think of it, you ignoramus; find out what we stand for." (Applause.)

Now, because of the action of the chairman of the Resolutions Committee, I am inclined to believe that it would be wise that this convention should elect a special committee, a committee that shall be composed of men who have a possession of or who know not only grammatical laws, but who have ideas in addition to laws. (Applause.)

DEL. BRANDT (Mo.): I am going to make a motion, and I request or ask this question of the chair: Can I preface my motion with what I have to say, or shall I make my motion first and speak afterwards?

THE CHAIRMAN: You can state the object of the motion; you cannot argue it.

DEL. BRANDT: The object of the motion is to create a committee to handle this matter, and my reason for it is this: I sat here in this hall this morning with the rest of the delegates and listened to what a great many of the other delegates thought was one of the most peculiar, wonderful statements or reports made by a committee through its chairman. But to us who were here in this hall four years ago we are not surprised, for we heard the same thing from the same source, and directed at the trade union committee at that time, and if you look over the records of the last convention you will find it there. Comrades and Mr. Chairman, my motion is this:

I move that this matter be referred to a special committee of three. I believe that it should be done that way, for I do say this, and whether it may be liked so much or not I care not. I do say this, that if that matter would go back to the Resolutions Committee, and if the man who presented that proposition would appear before them, I believe that every man in this hall who knows him would lose what respect they have got for him. I do not believe he should go near it after what has happened. And I do say in conclusion, if that committee is elected, that it matters not to me, nor neither will I vote for a scholar, but I want somebody on there who knows what the conditions are, who knows what such a thing as that should be and how it should be attended to. We want it grammatically right, yes, but we want it written grammatically right by people who know what these conditions are and who are suffering by the very person

who attacks them and calls for that letter. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I move you that a special committee of three be elected by this convention to take up that matter and see if that is suitable, or draft something in its place. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that a committee of three be elected to whom this shall be referred to draft a proper method or a different method.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am opposed to the motion to refer, as I was opposed to the other motion. From all this outcry against the statements of Theodore Roosevelt showing that he has given some attention to the literature of Socialism, for the purpose, naturally, of knocking Socialism; from all this outcry any one might think that we, the Socialist party, had elected Theodore Roosevelt president and that he had turned traitor to us. (Applause.) Such is not the case. Theodore Roosevelt was elected by the votes of the working class, certainly, but not on any working class program and not pledged to do anything for the working class, but, on the contrary, to do all he could to support the privileges and exploiting power of the master class. Has he failed in any degree? Has he not shown himself intelligent in reading the Socialist literature for the purpose of fulfilling his duties as a capitalist class president in fighting Socialism intelligently? As for this, it seems to be absurd that Socialists sent to a national convention of the party cry out as if they were hurt over a thing like this. The president says: "Every far-sighted patriot"—of course, that is a contradiction in terms, for the basis of patriotism is a narrow view—"every far-sighted patriot should protest first of all against the growth in this country of that evil thing which is called class consciousness." To Roosevelt and his masters certainly that is an evil thing.

We have been told on the floor of this convention that that is an insult to the Socialist party—an insult to us. Has Roosevelt in this accused us of anything that we consider an insult? He has accused us of preaching class consciousness. Are we insulted by that? For my part, when I read that charge I cried out in joy. (Applause.) I was joyous to find that Roosevelt had gone

so far in the study of Socialism as to realize our position, that we are preaching class consciousness and should declare it, and I did not feel insulted. In the first address that I made on this—and it was not the last, and it will not be the last from the soap box on this point—well, I won't say what follows just there, but he spoke of the demagogue; he uses the word "demagogue," and says, "The sinister or Socialist visionary who strives to arouse this feeling of class consciousness in our working people does a foul and evil thing and is no true American." When I read that I said, "Thank you, Theodore Roosevelt, and I accept the compliment." We should be glad, and we should not cry out to Roosevelt as if we were hurt and tell him he has hurt us. He has not; he has helped us by recognizing our own stand on class consciousness and the preaching of class consciousness to the working class; and to cry out to that is to place ourselves in an absurd position. That is the chief objection to doing anything about it at all.

There are many objections to the letter as it is written. For instance, in the appeal to the traditional figures of alleged American liberty; to the cold-blooded, aristocratic George Washington, who threw down every rebellious and really revolutionary spirit that was in advance of his own aristocratic adaptation that came from the mob. As to the action of the committee, I disapprove of their coming before this convention and stating that there had been a letter submitted to that committee, that it was bombastic and absurd and speaking of something that they were urging should not be brought before this convention at all. I think they were open to severe criticism. If there were any way to punish that committee without punishing the whole Socialist Party I should be in favor of that punishment, but the Socialist Party should not be punished to the extreme degree that the sending of this letter as an open letter to Theodore Roosevelt would be, for the sake of punishing that committee for what I feel to be ill-advised action. I think we should take no action at all in this convention, but on every soap box in the United States point to this, that we are preaching class consciousness, and that we disagree with Theodore Roosevelt in considering that action a foul and

evil thing. We admit that we are preaching class consciousness, and that is all that Theodore Roosevelt accuses us of doing; that is the act that he accuses us of doing. Do we consider that a foul and evil thing? Does any far-sighted, unpatriotic workman consider that a foul and evil thing?

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): Mr. Chairman and comrades, I stand in support of the amendment, and I want to pay my respects to the people that ridicule the original article. Unfortunately, I was born about thirty years ahead of my time, and I did not have the advantage of an education; that is the trouble with me.

A DELEGATE: You are all right.

DEL. COWAN: I know as much about grammar as I know about Greece. I have done some agitation. The president of the United States has attacked the principles of Socialism; he has not attacked any particular Socialist. It is the principles, one of the underlying principles of Socialism, class consciousness. As the speaker from New York states, we ought to make a reply. Now, I am not particular what the reply is so long as it is fixed up and couched in the right kind of language to suit the critics of the language. (Laughter.) I am not particular about the language. I can pretty near understand any that is spoken along the line I have been taught myself. Why should we at this time reply to the president of the United States? Remember, that you are going to meet men on the road who are not intellectuals. Some of them learn what they do learn in the workshop of life, like myself. I would like to see the intellectuals get down to this document and fix it up right away and make a good one and put it into my hands, so that I would be able to answer it intelligently when we were asked why we didn't answer him. Do you catch on? Do I make myself plain? The fellow that don't know is willing to be taught, and I am one of them. When we go out on the road those questions will arise, and we are now entering a presidential campaign. We are going into one of the greatest fights that the Socialists ever had in the United States, and probably in the world, for that matter. We deal with conditions here; we don't deal with them in any other part of the world. Here is a document, here

is a statement of the president of the United States. He is the president of the whole United States, and he makes an attack on Socialism. We simply sneer; we simply refuse to reply to it. Remember, my friends, he is the chief magistrate, and we probably number all told about a million in the United States amongst the eighty-three or eighty-four million. The people all don't see as we see. Now, we want this document right now. Why? So that I can present it to any audience I may appear before and say, "Here is our reply to the slanders of the president of the United States. I have a document here that I am not ashamed of, and you can read it for yourselves." Now, I can't get up that document, but I am here asking that this committee may be appointed, that the document may be written and that it may be issued. I agree with the comrade from New York that it would be one of the best propaganda documents we will have during this election. There is no question about it. (Applause.) Now, we don't want to abuse the president of the United States. That is simply the tactics of the pettifogger all over, when he has no case, to abuse the opposing attorney. Now, you can take it and put it in English. I don't know much about it, but I say we want to issue it so that the wayfaring man, though a fool in those matters, will not err on this point, that what the Socialists stand for is right and justice and eternal truth. Send it to the president of the United States, who is worshipped and adored by hundreds of thousands, yes, million, of people in the United States, who believe that he is the Moses that is going to lead them out of the wilderness. There are some Moseses in the Socialist party, and we have heard from them in this convention. So I think we had better go to work and post up the capitalists as far as we possibly can. I say I stand here for the appointment of that committee on those lines.

DEL. PAYNE (Tex.): Comrades, the members in this convention are comrades scattered all over the United States. They come from the rank and file of the Socialist Party. After all, the greatest work and the work most worth while is that done by the rank and file of the Socialist Party, the workmen and the workingwomen on the

farm, in the mill and factory and shop, wherever we find them. And today we are here to express the will of these people, and I am here to say that I am ashamed when one of you gets up and proposes something which expresses his opinion in our convention, that he receives a slap in the face and ridicule. (Applause.) The night is never too dark and it is never too cold or too hot for the comrades to go to get speakers and take them wherever they are to go. When there is a call made on them they go down in their pocketbooks for the funds to carry on the work of Socialism. And then when they come to conventions they are ridiculed because they cannot couch their sentiments in language suitable and that will sound harmonious to these educated delegates, to the ears of those scholars. (Applause.) Now, I like scholarship, but if I have to choose between scholarship and ideas I will take ideas every time. (Applause.) Now, so far as the comrades' communication was concerned, we sat before you and heard it read. If this convention had not risen up as one man almost and said, "We will hear it read," we would never have known what it was. I could scarcely keep from shouting. I was so pleased with the sentiment expressed there. (Applause.) There was nothing that was ridiculous or unreasonable in that. If he made a mistake in the expression when he undertook to mean the capitalist class when he said capitalism, we could understand that. And our comrade over there said that it was the A, B, C of Socialism. Why, there is no use to send any other kind of communication to President Roosevelt.

DELEGATES: Hurrah for Texas! What's the matter with Texas? She's all right, the best in the bunch.

DEL. PAYNE: Now, I do not think there should be any feeling between any of the proletarians and the intellectuals. We should all work together. If a working man from the ranks of labor, or a workingwoman, sees fit to give us something in this convention that will be for the benefit of the Socialist movement, then I say that if it is not couched in terms that we wish to go out all over the world, let some of our intellectuals couch it in such language, and let us not be found giving a slap in the face to one of our worthy comrades. So I close, by

saying that I am in favor of the amendment; I am in favor of submitting this to a committee and of having this sent to the president of the United States (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the comrade from Arkansas or recognize him, I want to say this to the convention, that I do not think any one has questioned the judgment or criticized the grammar used in that article.

DEL. JONES (Ark.): Comrades, I have a very profound respect for this convention, first; I have a very profound respect for the individuals of which it is composed. If you will permit, I want to suggest that there is due this comrade from Missouri a vote of thanks for the splendid suggestions couched in the letter which he wrote. I believe that it comes within the province of our essential duty to take up this letter, as has been indicated by this splendid woman who has just addressed us from Texas, and embody the gist of that letter, as she has already said, in language suitable to the "refined and classic air of America," if you please. (Laughter.)

This comrade manifests a degree of learning which warrants all in believing he understands the fundamental laws of Socialism. And if you will pardon me for this suggestion, the philosophy of Socialism is so broad, so deep and so wide that it even incorporates the essential interest of every man, not only in this country, but everywhere. The philosophy of Socialism, as I understand it, my friends, is broad enough to take in the tramp at one end of the line and Rockefeller at the other. If you look to the best interests of society, if the ultimate inauguration of the principles of Socialism is what our philosophy teaches us, it is absolutely for all. In our class consciousness we are, if

you please, to so organize human society as to bring human society within the limits of the line of its social organic being. Every man, from the manual laborer up to the philosopher, has his position in society and will be taken care of. Is that not correct? In our terms often we are misleading. I do not believe that Socialism means that every man shall become a manual laborer. I believe, my friends, that class consciousness is a very broad term. It does not incorporate only one class of workers, but every class of workers

whose work is identified with the best interests of the social organic being, based upon the principles of the collective ownership and the democratic management of public utilities. That is my understanding of Socialism. And I believe, my friends, that as has been indicated by other speakers upon the floor, this is a very opportune time to issue from this splendid gathering of representatives from different parts of the country a propaganda that will make a demand that is felt, as was indicated by the brother who stood upon the table, everywhere we go. This will meet the demand in a way that will have the appreciation of every comrade throughout the whole country. I believe this comrade has served us as probably no other comrade will be able to do in suggesting a line of action which will contribute to the success of the Socialist party this year. I believe, my friends, that we need to appoint a committee of three or five, and that this committee will from this letter formulate a letter in answer to President Roosevelt in language that is adequate, in language that is duly respectful toward the president of the United States. If there is a people in this country who can speak calmly, dispassionately, in response to the language uttered by the president, it is the Socialist who is well equipped, who understands the philosophy of Socialism. In the language used by the president of the United States he simply challenged the Socialist Party, and the Socialist Party is adequate to the emergency and can reply to his challenge and reply to it in a splendid way. If my time is not up, I wish to yield the floor to the comrade from Missouri.

(Question repeatedly called for.)

DEL. HILLOUT (N. Y.): Comrades, I shall not detain you long. I wish to say to you, first of all, I regret exceedingly that the tone which has marked the last portion of our debate should have crept into our councils at this time. I think it is very unfortunate. It will not aid our deliberations if we shall attempt to get up some imaginary differences between ourselves instead of defining the difference between the Socialist movement and anything outside of the Socialist movement. (Applause.) I deny that there are two currents here; I deny that there is any antagonism between the so-called intellectuals and the so-called proletarians. I claim that all

members of this convention, no matter from what walk of life they come, have come as Socialists, as representatives of the proletarian movement, and are working and should be working in accord together. (Applause.) The man who makes an appeal on the floor of this convention to any antagonism between ourselves does not serve the cause of Socialism. (Applause.)

I am opposed to this letter. I am opposed to the appointment of a committee. I am opposed to any official communication being sent by this national convention of the Socialist Party to Theodore Roosevelt, arguing with him points of theory on the Socialist program. (Applause.) I think it is undignified; I think it is illogical; I think we do a very ridiculous and childish act if we do so. Now, comrades, it is easy to be carried off your feet by a phrase, and it is easy to get excited for a moment and commit an act of indiscretion. We are brought here to deliberate and not to be swayed by superficial sentiment. (Applause.) What sense, I ask you, does the adoption of such a letter have? If this convention had decided to address President Roosevelt as the representative of the national government on certain grievances, with a certain petition to him as the representative of the national government, I might understand it. But what we are asked to do is to enter into a discussion with him on a theoretical subject, and that I say we are not called upon to do. And I say more: Theodore Roosevelt as a theoretician, as a social scientist, is not worthy of your attention. (Applause.) Why a letter to Theodore Roosevelt? Why not pick out some statement ignorantly made of every politician, every so-called statesman, from village constable up to the president of the United States, and send open letters from the convention to each and every one of them and discuss matters with them? If a letter is to be addressed to Theodore Roosevelt, why on this particular question? Because he happened to speak about it or write about it a couple of weeks ago, and because Comrade Hoehn happened to remember it? He has done other things during his term of administration. Is not Theodore Roosevelt the man who on the eve of a very important trial branded the defendant as a criminal and an undesirable citizen? Won't you write a little com-

munication on that account? (Applause.) Why not write a little letter to the Supreme Court of the United States about their decisions and discuss the law with them? (Applause.) Why not write a letter to John D. Rockefeller and have a heart-to-heart talk with him about his length of life?

Comrades, in our declaration of principles, in our platform, in our resolutions, we state the stand of the Socialist Party, and I say we have absolutely no business, without making ourselves ridiculous, to get out a sarcastic letter, even if it be excellently worded, discussing with Theodore Roosevelt a phase of his message. Now, mind you, Comrade Hoehn might do it; Comrade Spargo might do it; every one of you might do it. Publish it in your papers; do it in any way you please. But, I pray you, let this convention, these representatives of a large political party, not belittle itself or themselves to the extent of entering into a controversy, which, no matter how you word it, will remain undignified, will remain foolish. Comrades, we have plenty of work before us. We don't have to go out for work. Here we are, on the fourth day, and we have not as yet approached any one of the objects for which we have come here, and still the first thing is a letter drafted by a very gifted comrade, but yet something entirely out of our province, which takes one of our seven days' work, and you are ready still to discuss it. Get down to business, I ask you. (Applause.)

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): Mr. Chairman and comrades, I want to say, first of all, as a member of the Resolutions Committee, that had Comrade Spargo been directly in favor of the proposition which was presented here, which we as members of the Resolutions Committee all unanimously were against, the speech that he made as a preface before introducing our position was enough to cause you to be swayed just the other way. I am against sending that resolution to President Roosevelt. Sentiment, we must remember, should not be the kind of logic that should sway Socialist audiences. I admit that there was a good deal of oratory upon this floor, and I admit, and you must also admit, that oratory oftentimes carries a man off from the field of reason, away from the field of logic. On the impulse

of the moment and for the moment we lose sight of the substance and the logic of the proposition presented. Remember this, comrades; ours is not fundamentally a party of protest. Remember, that we stand as a revolutionary party. We are not alone to convert or to bother, mind you, for the purpose of converting or attacking a man who does not represent or does not claim to represent the working class. (Applause.) No, comrades, I do not believe in this sort of stuff. When Comrade Fieldman was upon the floor he told us about President Roosevelt as a representative of the people. But we as Socialists point out that President Roosevelt only represents that part of the people whom the dominant class in society represent and whom he is the arch representative of. I contend, as we all understand and claim fundamentally, that men are moved and act according to their material environment. Men who are elected to political office necessarily represent of that class. There are a great many men—don't forget, it has been stated upon this floor—workmen, men whom we are out to convert, men whom look upon President Roosevelt as a god. We admit, as we have always admitted, that the policy of some of you, some of our Socialist friends, in attacking certain men in the labor movement who do not agree with our principles, has kept the Socialists' movement back. Why? Because the men who believed in those individuals were blinded on the impulse of the moment, blinded to the fundamental fact. It is only because we have reasoned our way out of it, only because we have actually realized that the best way to undermine the influence of the men on top, the best way to undermine the hero whom certain individuals that we are out to convert, whom the working class in society are worshipping, is to ignore those fellows by talking straight logic, talking straight Socialism, to the men whom we have got to convert. Now, I say, my friends and comrades, that sentiment is all right, but ours is a struggle. We have a hard fight. Eliminate all personalities. We are all standing for the same principle. If Comrade Hoehn wants that proposition to be sent out to the world, I have got no objection to the body substance of it. I do not agree with Comrade

Lewis in the position of criticising it. You could edit, if you agree with the basis of the proposition and believe in sending that to the president of the United States. My contention is that we must not allow ourselves to be carried away by sentiment. (Calls of "Time.") Allow me to conclude. The point is, shall we consider the individuals as more important than the class struggle? I do not think it is absolutely necessary to attack an individual in order to bring forth the fact that any proposition is true.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): There has been a great deal said on both sides. Much of what has been said on both sides has been right, and much of what has been said on both sides has been wrong. Now, what we want to do is to pick out the right from both sides. Now, let us see if we cannot do it, and I have got a proposition that I think will do it if you will listen to me. In the first place, shall we send a personal letter to the president of the United States?

DELEGATES: No.
DEL. TOOLE: Of course, we oughtn't. We have got nothing to do with that. In the second place, ought we not to take advantage of the opportunity the president has given us to teach class consciousness? Yes. Well, how can we do it? That is the proposition. How can we avoid being ridiculous, and at the same time take advantage of this opportunity to teach class consciousness to the working class of this country? If we can find a way to do this, then we have done the right thing. Now, I propose that this convention do this—(losing his footing and slipping)—no, not that. I propose this: that this whole matter be referred to the Committee on Platform, with instructions that they place in that platform—(laughter)—wait a minute. Now, wait a minute, comrades; I am not half as foolish as half of you have been. (Laughter.) We want and should welcome the opportunity to teach class consciousness. Where is the place, where is the proper place for us to declare that we stand for class consciousness? Why, in the platform of the party, in the platform of the party; and if the platform of the Socialist party is drawn properly, it can take advantage of this matter. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that this whole matter be referred

to the Platform Committee, with instructions to place a plank in the platform as to our position on class consciousness.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is out of order, as there is a substitute before the house, and I recognized this delegate.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): Then I wish to move the previous question. (Seconded; carried.)

DEL. HANFORD (N. Y.): I wish to speak in favor of the substitute—to refer the letter to a committee for editing and revising, and that it then be adopted. I will be very brief if you will not interrupt me, and will try to save one or two minutes out of my five. First of all, to my mind this convention should very clearly and explicitly resent the imputation of the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions. When he brought in this report on Comrade Hoehn's document he characterized it as unfit to be read before this body. (Applause.) The natural inference from that was, either that the document was foolish or else that it was couched in such terms as are not in use among people of good repute. However, we finally did get the document read. After it had been read we found that, whatever else it may be, it is just as fitting that this body here should hear it as anything that has ever been printed in Socialist literature. (Applause.) I am not one of those who proposed to make or add to any division that may exist between the so-called intellectuals and the proletariat. I regret that there is any ground of friction between them. To my mind, the proletariat cannot be too thoroughly imbued with the proletarian spirit. It is one of my misfortunes, and I confess it not only with regret but with a certain measure of shame, that I am not and never hope to be a good master of the English language; but I want to say to Comrade Lewis, and to all those others who labor under the apprehension that this document is not in classic English—I want to say to them that it is in understandable English. (Applause.) It is in terms that workmen will understand. (Applause.) The class struggle is not a treatise on grammar. While the document is addressed to the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt, the only reason we take this notice of him

is, not to educate him, but to educate the man that works. (Applause.) Mr. Chairman, and the chairman of the Resolutions Committee, we need not fear that this convention will appear undignified when it resents the attack that has been made upon Socialism by the President of the United States. (Applause.) I am not afraid, after fifteen years of agitation in the Socialist party, of being called ridiculous when a man applies an undeserved epithet to me.

Comrade Kaplan is much worried lest some one be influenced by the heat of oratory. I want to tell Comrade Kaplan that oratory has its power in this one thing: it is oftentimes the fact that the true orator is right and that the man that is not capable of oratory is wrong. (Applause.)

I wish to say further to Comrade Hill, quit, that I am not at all alarmed as to whether this proposition be considered by the President of the United States. We simply address that man at the top of capitalist society in order to reach the multitude of men at its very bottom. (Applause.) I know perfectly well that the idea of ever educating Theodore Roosevelt is a hopeless task. (Applause.)

I remember away back in the year 1886, when Theodore Roosevelt, the man who now poses as a reformer—I remember that away back in 1886 he was so much a reformer that he opposed Henry George for Mayor of New York. I remember that ever since that time this same honorable gentleman that now is trying to make the workmen of this country think he is their friend—I remember that ever since that time he has been lined up with every scallawag and has been friends with every old gray wolf in Republican politics that this country has seen. (Applause.) He has been the distinguished friend of the Honorable Thomas C. Platt, the distinguished friend of the Honorable Chauncey M. Depew; "honorable," I say; there is classic English for Mr. Lewis. (Applause.) We know that this same man who today comes to the workmen of the United States and tells them he wants Congress to pass an anti-injunction bill, this man, what did he do not long ago? He tried to get the Honorable William H. Taft, Secretary of War—he tried to get that man, the old original, almost the inventor of the in-

junction against labor organizations in the United States—he tried to put him on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, and Taft would not take the appointment. And why? Why, because Taft and his masters, the capitalist class of the United States, thought that they could have Congress pass an anti-injunction bill if they had a pro-injunction President and a pro-injunction Supreme Court of the United States. So I say, let us expose their plans in every way that is possible, and send out a document that will be read by the working class, and every workman in the United States will make agitation for our cause and against that of the capitalist class. (Applause.)

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): I speak on the negative. Mr. Chairman, when I heard the remarks of Comrade Spargo I was the one who moved to lay this motion on the table. I am very glad now that it was not done. From the reading of this letter I heard nothing in the letter which was ridiculous or which was improper to be brought before this convention. But we are here offered a great opportunity, an opportunity that has never been offered to the Socialist party before, and we must not because of this opportunity let any hysterical measures pass before us. We have a great responsibility to our constituents. I deny the right of this convention to send any letter to Theodore Roosevelt as an executive document without a referendum to the party. (Applause.) We have our Platform Committee; we have our Resolutions Committee. Let us answer this imputation in our platform, but not in a personal letter to Theodore Roosevelt. My friends, it is an old trick of the lawyers, and—well, I don't say what I think about lawyers—but it is an old trick of theirs to get a rise out of the opposing lawyer. Now, Theodore Roosevelt does not send a message to Congress and has not sent one in a good many years when the Socialist party of this country has not gotten a rise out of it. Now, don't let Theodore Roosevelt get a rise out of the Socialists. Don't let him badger us into doing a foolish thing. Don't let this convention send him any letter. What we want to say, let us say in our platform.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I am utterly astonished at some of the statements

that have been made in this convention. I heard that letter read before ever it came to this convention. I did not listen for language, but I did listen for ideas, and this is the first impression that came to my mind, and when the impression came to my mind I said, "Yes, Comrade Hoeft, introduce it," and that impression was this, that in that letter was an answer to Theodore Roosevelt's challenge to the Socialist party. Now, I want to say that every man that has ever stood on a platform, that has ever said a word in behalf of Socialism, has been grossly insulted by that letter. I do not fight Theodore Roosevelt as an individual; no. But whom does he represent? Whom does Theodore Roosevelt represent? He represents the enemies of whom? Of the working class. And he did it deliberately. He did not say to the Democrat, "You are so and so." He did not say to the prohibitionist, "You are so and so." He did not say to the populist, "You are so and so." No, but with the same maliciousness, with the same underhanded method that he has always used, he employed the great position that he has been placed in, to do what? To keep the people who have not got the Socialist message yet, in ignorance, because he knows that whenever the American workmen understand Socialism, he and his class will walk out of the government, never to return. (Applause.) Now, then, I want to say that I am in favor of that committee. Why? You let this great Socialist convention adjourn and go home, and each one of you has clinging to you, applied by the President of the United States, the word "foul." That is attached to you. Every one of you that will leave this convention, you will go out with the word "foul" attached to you. Now, where is the class struggle? Why not answer him? We have got to answer him. It is up to us. We have got to face him, and we are going to face him. The day of martyrs in the Socialist party is past. We are standing on firm ground, and we are going to answer him. (Applause.) Now, then, what will we gain by it? Comrade Hanford has told you. I hope, comrades, you will elect this committee and we will send a letter which says to the capitalist class, "No longer can you denounce us without our coming back, because we are a militant organiza-

tion and we are going to win." (Applause.)

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman and comrades, I want the attention of your brains, and I care nothing for your passions at this time. I will yield to no man or woman on the floor of this convention in my adherence to what I conceive to be the sole principle of modern Socialism, the class struggle. And I ask you to remember, comrades, that the mouthpieces of revolutionary phrases described by Karl Marx were the men who tried to hound Marx himself out of the international movement, on the same ground of prejudice which has characterized most of this debate.

I myself have not raised the question of grammatical construction nor literary form with regard to this letter. If the letter were a rational letter, if it were a Socialist letter, if it were a letter in line with class struggle theory of modern Socialism, then I would say, comrades, let us send it. But I know that the letter is not in line with the class struggle, and there is not a Socialist on this convention floor, who understands that principle, who for a moment will be prepared to accept that letter.

First of all, is it a fact that when we go out to fight our capitalist foes, that because they use hard words about us we must drop the class struggle and protest that we are insulted? In the name of God, comrades, what are we about? We might as well talk of the class struggle and engrave it on a Tiffany pink tea invitation. (Applause.) If we do this it will be because in a moment of weakness we surrender to a sort of wave of demagoguery coming from another of my New York comrades and associates. Comrades, let me ask you, do you believe this statement which I will read? I care not if written in the language of the classics; I care not if every word were of the purest gold; I am not so sensitive as my friend Lewis is upon that matter; I am looking for Socialism. Here is the statement: "You, Mr. President, have repeatedly demanded from Congress laws for the benefit of the people, but your demands were ignored because of capitalist class interests."

A DELEGATE: Not a word of it.

DEL. SPARGO: I ask you, comrades, are you going to vote, are you going to say for a single moment that

Theodore Roosevelt is on the side of the working class?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. SPARGO: I say no. I will read further from the same letter: "If in place of the political undertakers there were seated in the halls of Congress fifty or one hundred class conscious working men and Socialists, every demand for labor legislation made by you or by organized labor would be voted." I ask you, comrades, are you going to play into the hands of Theodore Roosevelt and give him the best kind of a campaign weapon?

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. SPARGO: It is therefore not a question of grammar: It is a question of Socialist philosophy and of Socialist common sense; and I ask you to vote down the motion to refer; to vote down the motion to send it to Roosevelt, and send it where it belongs, under the table or anywhere else. (Applause.)

DEL. LEWIS (III): A question of personal privilege.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Lewis, on a question of personal privilege.

DEL. LEWIS: I have purposely refrained on this point from disturbing any previous speaker, but I wish to protest against the assumption that has run all through this controversy, that the point I raised was a question either of classic English or of grammar. It was a question of Socialist philosophy alone.

(Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the amendment referring to a committee will signify it by saying aye. Contrary, no.

A division was called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the motion will raise their hands. Contrary.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I desire to have my vote as a member of the Resolutions Committee recorded as voting against reference to committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The vote stands, affirmative 89, negative 101. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It now recurs on the motion that it be printed by the national office and a copy, together with the manifesto, be sent to the president. All in favor will say aye. Contrary, no. The noes seem to have it; they have it.

THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

DEL. SPARGO: Comrade Chairman and comrades, in continuing the report of the Resolutions Committee, will you permit me to say that no word I said concerning that resolution this morning or at any time was intended as any kind of a personal reflection upon my friend and comrade Hoehn from St. Louis. (Applause). There is not a man upon the floor of this convention for whom I entertain greater respect. But, comrades, I may have said something which did seem to be hard and bitter. If so, while that is still my opinion of the document, I desire to give this assurance, that I have no malice or no evil thought or opinion in my mind regarding either Comrade Hoehn or any other comrade who has participated in this discussion. (Applause.)

The last resolution that is part of our report is on the question of alcoholism. The delegates of the convention may know that there is a very considerable sentiment in favor of the convention taking some attitude upon the question of prohibition of the liquor traffic. There has been submitted to the committee and your committee beg to report a resolution which while not in line with the demand for prohibition of the liquor traffic, nor as stringent as the last resolution of the German party, is nevertheless important in that it is the first time that a Socialist party convention has been asked to pass upon the question of alcoholism at all. I hope, therefore, that every delegate, and for that matter the visitors, will listen as carefully as possible, so that there may be no misunderstanding:

"We fully recognize the serious evils incident to the manufacture and sale for private profit of alcoholic and adulterated liquors. We hold that any excessive use of liquor by members of the working class is a serious obstacle to the triumph of our class since it impairs the vigor of the fighters in the political and economic struggle, and we urge the members of the working class to avoid any indulgence that might hinder the progress of the movement for their emancipation.

"On the other hand, we do not believe that the evils of alcoholism can be remedied by any extension of the

police powers of the capitalist state. Alcoholism is a disease of which capitalism is the chief cause, and the remedy lies rather in doing away with the underlying, overwork and overworry which result from the wage system."

The reading of the resolution was received with applause.

DEL. SPARGO: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Resolutions Committee I move the adoption of the resolution I have read.

Motion seconded by various members. THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded to adopt the resolution as reported. Are you ready for the question?

DEL. HILLOUT: Just a question to the chairman of the Resolutions Committee. Would the committee accept the expression "cured" instead of the expression "remedied" in one place? The expression as it stands now, is, I believe, that the evil cannot be remedied by any extension of the police powers. Now, I am afraid that is overstating the proposition. It may be remedied somewhat, but it certainly cannot be cured.

DEL. SPARGO: The chairman of the Resolutions Committee would say that in our discussions we developed the point that we were willing, I think, to accept such changes as that. Unless one of my colleagues objects I have no hesitation in saying that we would accept it. The request is to change the word "remedied" to "cure." I would also say that the chairman of your Resolutions Committee is himself quite unable to distinguish between a cure and a remedy. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection it is now cured. (Laughter.)

DEL. HILLOUT: It may be in order, if I may be pardoned, to offer advice to the Resolutions Committee—

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it has been accepted.

DEL. HILLOUT: I would say that there is a great difference between the two.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may send a dictionary to the committee.

Question called for.

The motion was carried and the resolution adopted as changed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FARMERS' PROGRAM.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the Committee on Farmers' Program.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.), reporting for the committee: Comrades, we have had only one meeting and are not able to make a complete report, but there is one point upon which we were absolutely agreed, all of us, and I believe that all the rest of you will agree, and that was in this, and so we report this to be our recommendation at this time, hoping to have this accepted, rather than holding another session later to report further upon this question. The committee agreed unanimously in recommending this item:

"Your committee recommends that this convention elect a committee of seven to study the agricultural question in its relation to Socialism and report recommendations to the membership of the party through the Socialist press at least one year before the next national convention."

The report was adopted and election of permanent committee deferred.

RESPONSE TO SARAH A. BIGELOW.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The secretary was instructed to draft a letter in response to the mother of Comrade Bigelow. I will read it:

To Mrs. Sarah A. Bigelow, 1149 Jackson Boul., Chicago.

Beloved and venerable comrade: Your message was read to the convention and received with reverent attention and applause. To you, dear comrade, mother of one of our bravest propagandists, who gave his great life to a greater cause, it has been the destiny of life to give to the Socialist movement a noble, faithful and beloved comrade. Amid the tears with which you water his grave and hallow his memory may the love of his and your comrades gladden and sanctify your sunset years.

Signed for the Convention,
National Socialist Convention.
Chicago, May 13, 1908.

DEL. OHARE (Okla.): I move its adoption by a rising vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded that the communication be ap-

proved and that the same be sent; all in favor will please rise.
The motion was adopted unanimously by a rising vote.

LENGTH OF SPEECHES.

DEL. WHEAT (Cal.): I listened to the debate this morning; and I noticed that comrade after comrade repeated the same thought over and over again. The comrades as a rule said just as much in five minutes as they said in ten. It seemed to me that as we must get through with the business of this convention, and as every five minutes costs us money, we ought to do something in that direction, and I desire to move that we reconsider the rule and that five minutes instead of ten shall be set as the limit for speakers in debates.

The motion to reconsider was seconded and carried.
A motion to limit speeches to five minutes was carried.

DELEGATES' MILEAGE.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I have a supplementary statement to offer which was promised this morning. A number of questions were asked relating to payments since the report given this morning was closed. That report was closed on the 8th of May. This brings the report up to the close of business last evening, in regard to this question of the payment of assessment stamps. I wish to add further that I know there are several state secretaries in the hall who have money, and who say they have not had an opportunity to visit the office and turn it in.

California \$ 77.00
Idaho 50
Indiana 6.65

Iowa 26.95
Maine 13.65
Massachusetts 211.65
Montana 16.00
New Mexico 7.25
Oregon 46.10
South Dakota 6.30
Texas 35
Utah 24.20
West Virginia 4.90
Wyoming 1.75

Total \$437.26

Making a grand total for assessments until close of business last night \$7,580.30, and by collections \$389.75 or a total of \$7,970.05.

This represents as near as we can estimate, and I believe we have estimated largely, about one hundred dollars in excess of our total liabilities for mileage to delegates.

On motion the supplemental report of the secretary was adopted.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I would like to ask the secretary if he can give the names of those who have money ready to turn over and the amounts.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I stated that several secretaries so informed me. I don't remember who they are exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection the supplementary report will go to the auditing committee.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I desire to state with regard to the amount credited to New York that before I left for Chicago from New York I sent to Comrade Barnes three hundred dollars. That was on account of the amount coming from the state of New York. I have in the meantime collected three hundred dollars more; and I have no doubt that by the time I return to New York there will be two hundred dollars more.
Adjourned.

FIFTH DAY'S SESSION

The convention was called to order at 10 o'clock A. M.

Asst. Sec. Strickland read a number of communications, as follows:

COMMUNICATIONS.

"May 13.
"To the National Convention, Socialist Party, Brand's Hall, Chicago.

"The Socialist party of Washington gratefully acknowledges in this manner revolutionary stand by national convention. This will enable us to make better light than ever against capitalism without, by disposing of enemies within. No compromise forever.

"Arthur Jensen,
(Signed)
"Acting Secretary."

(Translation of Lettish telegram.)

"Boston, May 19, 1908.

"Convention Socialist Party, Chicago, Ill., U. S. A., Brand's Hall.

"The Central Committee, United Lettish Social Democracy of America, sends its heartiest greetings to convention of Socialist party of America, and asks also to put the immigration question on the order of business and to consider that from all sides, as it is of the utmost importance to us. In the name of the United Lettish Social Democrats of America, and by order of the Central Committee.

"John Klauber,
"Secretary."

"Port Perry, Pa., May 13.
"Chairman, National Convention, Chicago.

"Comrades, success to your national convention. May its deliberations be marked by kindness among all comrades and antagonism to our opponents. May the results of our convention strike dismay into the hearts of all supporters of this hell upon earth and fire the hearts of all comrades throughout the length and breadth of the land with a determination to so order themselves from now on that our vote next November shall strike terror into the hearts of the capitalists, inspire hope in the hearts of the working class, and bring complete victory four years hence. Yours for the abolition of hell.
"W. Blenco.
"P. S.—I would have sent this by wire, but did not like to support the philanthropic telegraph companies any more than is absolutely necessary."

Del. Clark, of Texas, was elected chairman for the day.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I may not be a very good parliamentarian, and you may say when I get through that I have not been a close reader of parliamentary law, but if you stick to your constitution better than you have been sticking you won't call on me to stick to parliamentary law today. So let us not demand too much, but let us start out in a systematic way and we will expedite matters in a far more thorough manner than we have been doing before.

A newly arrived delegate, Ryckman, of Wyoming, was seated without referring his credential to the Credentials Committee.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.), reporting for the Committee on Labor Organizations: Mr. Chairman and Delegates, your Committee on Labor Organizations is glad to be able to make a unanimous report. (Applause.) I think it will not be necessary in introducing this report to make any extended remarks. I suppose it is very likely the report will be debated upon the floor, and I should perhaps be only wasting time if I should give any statement on behalf of the committee in introducing this report, further than to say this: that it has been the judgment of your committee—and

they have believed that they represented the judgment of the convention as a whole in this—it has been the judgment of your committee that the declaration that this convention should adopt upon the subject of labor organizations this year should not be, as have been our declarations in the past, simply a declaration of the attitude, the formal attitude of the party legally, so to speak, toward trade unionism, but that it should be in the nature of an address, a statement, a somewhat emphatic statement, of the position of the Socialist party with regard to the trade unions, as they find themselves face to face with the organizations of the capitalist class on line of battle; and it is with this idea in view that your committee has drawn the declaration which I now read to you, and which, after it is read, I shall move to be adopted:

ADDRESS TO ORGANIZED LABOR.

The following is the address to organized labor drafted by the committee and submitted to the Socialist National convention:

"The movement of organized labor is a natural result of the antagonism between the interests of employers and wage-earners, under the capitalist system. Its activity in the daily struggle over wages, hours, and other conditions of labor is absolutely necessary to counteract the evil effects of competition among the working people and to save them from being reduced to material and moral degradation. It is equally valuable as a force for the social, economic and political education of the workers.

It Does Not Dictate.

"The Socialist party does not seek to dictate to organized labor in matters of internal organization and union policy. It recognizes the necessary autonomy of the union movement on the economic field, as it insists on maintaining its own autonomy on the political field. It is confident that in the school of experience organized labor will as rapidly as possible develop the most effective forms of organization and methods of action.

"In the history of the recent Moyer-Haywood protest, participated in by unions of all sorts and by the Socialist party, it finds reason to hope for closer solidarity on the economic field and for

more effective co-operation between organized labor and the Socialist party, the two wings of the movement for working-class emancipation.

"The Socialist party stands with organized labor in all its struggles to resist capitalist aggression or to wrest from the capitalists any improvement in the conditions of labor. It declares that it is the duty of every wage-worker to be an active and loyal member of the organized labor movement, striving to win its battles and to strengthen and perfect it for the greater struggles to come.

Confronted by Great Crisis.

"Organized labor is today confronted by a great crisis. The capitalists, intoxicated with wealth and power and alarmed by the increasing political and economic activity of the working class, have as a class undertaken a crusade for the destruction of the labor organizations. "In Colorado, Nevada, Alaska and elsewhere law and constitution have been trampled under foot, military despotism set up, and judicial murder attempted with this aim in view. Where such violent methods have not seemed advisable, other means have been used to the same end.

"The movement for the so-called open shop but thinly veils an attempt to close the shops against organized workingmen; it is backed by powerful capitalist organizations, with millions of dollars in their war funds.

Courts Always Hostile.

"The courts, always hostile to labor, have of late outdone all previous records in perverting the law to the service of the capitalist class. They have issued injunctions forbidding the calling of strikes, the announcement of boycotts, payment of union benefits, or even any attempt to organize unorganized workmen in certain trades and places. They have issued arbitrary decrees dissolving unions under the pretense of their being labor trusts.

"They have sustained the capitalists in bringing damage suits against unions for the purpose of tying up or sequestering their funds. They have wiped off the statute books many labor laws—laws protecting little children from exploitation in the factory, laws making employers liable for damage in case

of employees killed or injured at their work, laws guaranteeing the right of workmen to belong to unions.

"While affirming the right of employers to bar organized workmen from employment, they have declared it unlawful for workmen to agree not to patronize non-union establishments. The only consistent rule observed by the courts in dealing with the labor question is the rule that capitalists have a sacred right to profits and that the working class has no rights in opposition to business interests.

Danbury Hatters' Case.

"In the Danbury hatters' case the United States Supreme court has rendered a decision worthy to stand with its infamous 'Dred Scott decision' of fifty years ago. It has stretched and distorted the Anti-Trust law to make it cover labor organizations, and has held that the peaceful method of the boycott is unlawful, that boycotted employers may recover damages to the amount of three times their loss, and that the property of individual members, as well as the union treasures, may be levied upon to collect such damages.

"By this decision the Supreme court has clearly shown itself to be an organ of class injustice not of social justice. If this and other hostile decisions are not speedily reversed, organized labor will find itself completely paralyzed in its efforts toward a peaceful solution of the labor question. The success of the capitalists and their courts in this assault upon the labor movement would be a disaster to civilization and humanity. It can and must be defeated.

Ballot is a Weapon.

"At this critical moment the Socialist party calls upon all organized workingmen to remember that they still have the ballot in their hands and to realize that the intelligent use of political power is absolutely necessary to save their organizations from destruction. The unjust decision of the Supreme court can be reversed, the arbitrary use of the military can be stopped, the wiping out of labor laws can be prevented by the united action of the workmen on election day.

"Workmen of the United States, use your political arm in harmony with

your economic arm for defense and attack. Rally to the support of the party of your class. Vote as you strike, against the capitalists. Down with military and judicial usurpation! Forward, in one solid phalanx, under the banners of Organized Labor and of the Socialist party, to defeat capitalist aggressions, to win immediate relief for yourselves and your wives and children, and to hasten the day of complete emancipation from capitalist exploitation and misuse."

DEL. LEE: I move the adoption of this declaration. (Seconded.)

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): Mr. Chairman, I rise, not to object to any part of the resolution that is presented here by our Labor Committee, but I do contend that there is something lacking that necessarily should be inserted, and it is this: We have arrived at a time when capitalism is organizing all along the line. The principle of trustification is evident, whichever way we may turn. I see in this resolution, however, no statement in any manner, shape or form recommending to organized labor the necessity of studying up the question of the industrial form of unionism. (Applause.) Now wait a moment. I am not saying that that necessarily anticipates the starting of an opposition economic organization in any part of the country against those that are already in existence. I believe that the tactics of the old Socialist Labor party in undertaking to formulate and inaugurate the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance was decidedly detrimental and decidedly injurious; but I do contend, on the other hand, had they used the same principle, had they told our membership and had they said to the workers, those who had become class conscious, "Work within the American Federation of Labor, work within your other pure and simple organizations and ask them to realize and point out the necessity of working along class lines rather than craft lines;" (applause)—"if that had been done, I believe we would have had today a greater Socialist movement. I believe the American Federation of Labor would have been a good deal more advanced than it is today.

In the city of Duluth at the present time there is not a strike, but a lockout. Why? Because the men connected with the different building trades have said that "We will back up one union, the one

out on strike; we will back up its fight and we will fight and stand on that proposition united." And because that happened, they recognized what? That united action along class lines, united action, working together, all the different labor organizations, meant something that once the labor organizations introduced as a principle within the American Federation of Labor would enable them to do something, to accomplish some results today. So they got together and forced a lock-out. They said to those men, "We are not against you men working within your individual labor organizations. We are not against your fighting us as individual organizations, but just as soon as you undertake to work together, that is another proposition." I want to say this, that there is only one union there, the Bricklayers, that did not participate in the conference, and what was the result? We have the Bricklayers' union in the City of Duluth with union men working side by side with scabs; that is the result. Mind you, I am not blaming the Bricklayers' Union, but that is the result of the principle of craft unionism. And I am not attacking, as I say, the American Federation of Labor. I am not saying that we must endorse or say that you must start an opposition economic organization, but I do say that you must make and embody in that resolution a recommendation suggesting to members of organized labor to recognize that principle and try to work for that principle and formulate it within their particular labor organizations. I thank you. (Applause.)

DEL. FARRELL (Ohio): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I am of the opinion that to adopt the report of the Committee on Organized Labor would not be a mistake on the part of this convention. The comrade from Duluth has pointed out what the building trades of that city are doing in regard to developing the industrial side of organized labor. As a member of a craft organization I want to say that I heartily endorse the industrial form of organization. (Applause.) But let me tell you that there is a force at work that is causing the American Federation of Labor organization and affiliated crafts to adopt industrial forms of organized labor, just the same force that caused the Socialist movement to be given birth.

I want to say as a member of one of the building trades organizations, that that part of the organized labor movement of this country is getting together today as one solid organization. A few years ago they organized what is known as the Structural Building Trade Alliance, aside from the American Federation of Labor, an organization composed of all the various building trade crafts. Eventually they got in touch with the American Federation of Labor, and it is now known as the building trade section of the American Federation of Labor. It is practically an industrial form of organization in so far as the building trades of this country are concerned; it is nothing more or less than an industrial form of organization.

I want to say that this report of the committee, in pointing out that organized labor should control its movement on the economic field, just as the Socialist Party demands the right and declares the right to control its work on the economic field. (Applause.) I want to say that a few weeks ago, when the Citizens' Alliance and the Employers' Association, in the city of Dayton, with Mr. Van Cleave and one or two others there as invited guests, had their banquet at the Dayton Club, that Mr. Van Cleave in his address to the association pointed out the fact that if it should come to the point through the development of the class struggle that the working class and their friends should line up on one side, he and his class would be found lined up on the other side, regardless of politics, creed or color. (Applause.) And I want to say that those things are awakening the craft organizations which go to make up the American Federation of Labor organized movement.

I would say to this convention, adopt that report as we have got it here. There is one thing we have learned in the last four years that I wish to compliment our Socialist movement on, and this convention particularly, that we have today found out how to draft up a resolution of this kind without any particular friction on the part of our convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

DEL. FARRELL: I hope this thing will go through without a dissenting vote, and I thank you.

DEL. KEARNS (N. J.): I feel that we have made a magnificent step for-

ward from the position we occupied yesterday, in that we are extending the courtesy of silence to each of the speakers and allowing them to have their say without interruption. I will thank you for the same courtesy that you have extended to the others. I am in a measure muzzled by my state, and I am further crippled by the fact that I am an Irishman (laughter), and an Irishman, you know, is allowed, as a rule, to talk until he is understood. (Laughter.) Before I take the position that I am directed to take, I want to say that aspersions have been cast upon the state of New Jersey almost to the measure of charging us with cowardice. I feel that we can well afford to let that go by, because the history of the state of New Jersey is not only clear, but clean and straight, and there is not a coward among us.

I am directed by my state to oppose any action tending toward the recognition of the S. L. P., any move toward unity with that organization, because we have passed through that period and know it is utterly impossible to mix with that bunch. I am also directed to oppose any recognition of craft unionism as against industrialism, but I am confident that the state of New Jersey stands as a unit for organized labor as a whole. (Applause.) While I have not been instructed I do want to say that a serious mistake or omission has been made by this committee, and that is that you have not once mentioned the women; and I move that this address be so changed that wherever "workingmen" is mentioned the addition of "and women" be made (applause), because they are a part of our organization, and I so move, Comrade Chairman. (Seconded.)

DEL. OSBORNE (Cal.): I would like to ask if that means that wherever there is a man the man is to embrace the woman. (Laughter.)

DEL. MARGUERITE PREVEY (Ohio): Comrades and friends, it seems to me that it is unnecessary to bring up the question of women in the resolution that has just been put in by the Resolutions Committee. You know there is a committee working on the question of the relation of women to the Socialist movement, or the relation of the Socialist movement to women, and we were before the Platform Committee last evening, and asked the Platform Committee that when they mentioned

workingmen they would also mention workingwomen, and the Platform Committee is going to take care of that proposition, so it seems to me that when organized labor is mentioned the women are included in that way. The women in the Socialist movement do not want any special recognition. All we ask for is the same recognition as men. The women in the Socialist movement are able to speak for themselves, and when the question of the relation of women to Socialism comes up we will be heard. Now, I want to say one word in reference to the resolution that has been brought in by this committee, and I want to say that I heartily endorse those resolutions. We of the Socialist Party believe that the Socialist movement came into existence as an economic necessity of the working class, and that the organized labor movement came into existence, like every other institution in the world, as an economic necessity of the working class. The members of craft unionism in the American Federation of Labor are learning by the capitalist class opposing them, and by court decisions recently rendered, that the battle has been transferred from the industrial to the political field, and that they must get into the political arena if they expect to be saved or to get any of the wealth they produce. We cannot cram industrialism down the throat of the workingman. He learned to organize before the Socialist Party came into existence, and he is going into the industrial form of organization when he finds that he can get more of the products of his labor through that form. (Applause.) The working class do not need any dictation from the Socialist Party. They won't accept any dictation from the Socialist Party, and they are right. (Applause.) They do not need dictators. They are learning their own economic interests, and they are getting into the industrial form of organization just as rapidly as they are able to absorb the proposition. (Applause.) It does seem to me that every delegate in this convention who is a clear thinker should accept those resolutions, and they should be endorsed unanimously, so that we may go before the industrialists and before the craft unionists and say that the workers must go into the political arena if they expect to be saved. They must fight through the union of the craft or

the particular form of organization they wish. The American Federation of Labor, as I have said, has recognized the fact that industrial unionism is the political field. (Applause.)

DEL. WALDHORST (Ala.): I do not see anything whatever in these resolutions which is for industrialism, at least in a recommendation. I think we should not have a man that is an industrialist as well as a man that is a craft autonomist in his shop, and I think we have so much work at hand before us today, if we don't want to stay here another week, that the less we can say on these subjects and the shorter the better it will be. A good many are getting tired now, and it seems to me from the applause that you gave the speakers before me, you see how the sentiment stands in regard to these resolutions. One comrade who has spoken, I think has given the line of argument as impartially as I or anybody else could make it, and for that reason I move the previous question. (Seconded.)

DEL. WHEAT (Cal.): In regard to the first amendment I desire to move the previous question, simply for that

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question has been moved. All in favor of the previous question is put I wish to call the attention of the convention to the

DEL. KORNOLD (Ill.): I do not believe there are half of the people here who do not believe in industrial unionism. We might not believe in the tactics of the I. W. W. I for one believe that there are more industrialists in the American Federation of Labor than there are in the I. W. W., but I cannot see why we Socialists should not recognize that industrial unionism is a better form of organization than craft unionism. The American Federation of Labor, I believe, in the convention, one of them oppose a resolution endorsing industrial unionism, so certainly the Socialist Party need not be afraid of endorsing industrial unionism. Besides, we are not dictating to labor unions what they shall do; we are simply recommending. We Socialists have attacked Samuel Gompers and other leaders of the labor unions because they have not recommended to their followers to take political action. Why, then, should we as a political party not recommend to the labor unions to take industrial action? (Applause.) If we do not do so we are just as guilty as Samuel Gompers. (Applause.) There is no labor union which today does not believe in it. I do know the labor organizations are drifting toward industrial

DEL. KORNOLD (Ill.): I do not believe there are half of the people here who do not believe in industrial unionism. We might not believe in the tactics of the I. W. W. I for one believe that there are more industrialists in the American Federation of Labor than there are in the I. W. W., but I cannot see why we Socialists should not recognize that industrial unionism is a better form of organization than craft unionism. The American Federation of Labor, I believe, in the convention, one of them oppose a resolution endorsing industrial unionism, so certainly the Socialist Party need not be afraid of endorsing industrial unionism. Besides, we are not dictating to labor unions what they shall do; we are simply recommending. We Socialists have attacked Samuel Gompers and other leaders of the labor unions because they have not recommended to their followers to take political action. Why, then, should we as a political party not recommend to the labor unions to take industrial action? (Applause.) If we do not do so we are just as guilty as Samuel Gompers. (Applause.) There is no labor union which today does not believe in it. I do know the labor organizations are drifting toward industrial

DEL. KORNOLD (Ill.): I do not believe there are half of the people here who do not believe in industrial unionism. We might not believe in the tactics of the I. W. W. I for one believe that there are more industrialists in the American Federation of Labor than there are in the I. W. W., but I cannot see why we Socialists should not recognize that industrial unionism is a better form of organization than craft unionism. The American Federation of Labor, I believe, in the convention, one of them oppose a resolution endorsing industrial unionism, so certainly the Socialist Party need not be afraid of endorsing industrial unionism. Besides, we are not dictating to labor unions what they shall do; we are simply recommending. We Socialists have attacked Samuel Gompers and other leaders of the labor unions because they have not recommended to their followers to take political action. Why, then, should we as a political party not recommend to the labor unions to take industrial action? (Applause.) If we do not do so we are just as guilty as Samuel Gompers. (Applause.) There is no labor union which today does not believe in it. I do know the labor organizations are drifting toward industrial

Manifestations of objection from different delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may have four species if you want to. All in favor of the previous question say aye. Contrary, no.

A division was called for, and on a vote by raised hands the motion was carried.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): Was this previous question here on the amendment or on the main question?

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair rules that it carries both. Now, notice, the ruling of the house is that there remain two speeches on each side of this case, so tell the chair which side you desire to speak on.

DEL. HOGAN: I am opposed to the resolution. Mr. Chairman and comrades, I had hoped the previous question would not be ordered at this time, for the reason that there are a number of comrades whom I should have greatly desired to hear speak on this question. But since it has been ordered, since perhaps I may not have an opportunity to get the floor again, I am going to call your attention to some things occurring in this resolution to which your attention ought to be very forcibly directed, and more forcibly perhaps than I in my humble, weak way will be able to do. I desire, first, to call your attention to an expression down here in one paragraph under the subhead, "Courts Always Hostile," and I read from that paragraph: "The courts, always hostile to labor, have of late outdone all previous records in perverting the law." Those three words, "in perverting the law," are an expression to which I heartily object. I maintain that the courts of this country have not perverted the law; that the courts of this country have interpreted the law rightly; that they have interpreted the laws according as they were enacted and for the purpose they were enacted for; that the courts and the judges of the courts and the officers of the courts, so far as they are concerned, have interpreted the laws as they were enacted and intended to be interpreted, and have not perverted the law to any extent whatever. (Applause.) Here is another paragraph, under the same subhead, which says that the courts have "wiped off the statute books many labor laws, laws protecting little children from exploitation in the factory." That is a lie.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): It is not DEL. HOGAN: It is.

DEL. HUNTER (N. Y.): I want to speak against the amendment, because I don't believe it to be the business of a political party, even though that party be a working class party, to dictate to other organizations, industrial organizations, in the industrial field, their form of organization. I consider it an impertinence for the Socialist Party to attempt to tell the American Federation of Labor or the Industrial Workers of the World, or any other industrial or craft organization, the kind of organization which they should adopt in their particular field of activity.

Some of you know, perhaps, that I have spent some time recently abroad studying the European movement. I think they have got one thing clear in nearly every country in Europe, and that is that while these two organizations—the political and the industrial organization—are the two arms of the same man, yet those two arms must be kept completely and entirely autonomous. Although it is our proudest badge to represent the working class, we are here gathered, persons from all possible occupations and all possible positions. There are clergymen here, there are professors here, there are men of means, there are lawyers, all kinds of persons—it is manifestly unfair and unjust that an organization that is smaller in the political field than the industrial organizations are in the industrial field should dictate to them the kind of organization they should have.

It is also manifestly unwise for an organization which attempts to group within its circle the farmers and other unorganized workers and classes in the professions, and all classes of workers, brain workers and other workers, clerks and so on, to try to set a particular stamp upon an industrial organization.

Now, we ourselves are divided. There is a large number in this body who still believe in giving every possible support to the American Federation of Labor; many believe here that if the Industrial Workers or those who advocate the industrial form of organization and wish to have that form adopted by the labor movement, they should stay in the American Federation of Labor and try to get it adopted there. There are others who believe that they ought to go out

and try to force that form of organization upon all classes of workers organized and unorganized. They have a perfect right to such opinions. Those are questions of tactics. They have a perfect right to believe what they wish to. But have we as a party—we are divided among ourselves as the labor movement is divided among themselves—have we the right, in view of the great division existing here, to try to formulate a decision in regard to an organization that is not officially or definitely represented here?

Now, I hope very much that we will keep clearly to our political field. Let us give every possible support to every body of workmen organized in this country; let us fight their battles as though they were our battles, whether they adopt one form of organization or another form of organization. But let us try not to be so impertinent or swell headed as to believe that we can stand here and dictate to another movement outside of our specific field the kind of organization which it shall have.

DEL. HAYES (Ohio): Regarding the amendment before the house, it seems to me that if the comrades who are in favor of it would stop to consider that as we are now entering a great presidential contest the adoption of that proposition would tend to place us not in the position that we ought to occupy—that is, fighting aggressively—but rather we should be thrown upon the defensive, and you can readily understand that it will be injurious to the movement.

I know something about the internal struggles of the trades union movement of the United States through the past dozen years by reason of having been fortunate enough to attend the conventions of the Federation of Labor for ten years past, and I know also that the men who believe in craft autonomy as a general rule are just as honest and conscientious and sincere in their belief that they are benefiting themselves and those they represent as are the men on the other side who favor the industrial form of organization. The craft unions have benefited the organized workers of this country materially in the past. It is simply a question of how much longer they can continue to benefit them in the matter at least of keeping up wages, to accompany the rise in prices, and reducing the hours of labor in the various

establishments where they are employed. That is a question that only the future will determine. But I have found this, Mr. Chairman, especially during the past half-dozen years, that those who profess to be in favor of the industrial form of organization were seldom if ever found upon the battleground where the battle for industrialism must be made, and that is in organized labor. They tell us from the outside what to do in the matter of conducting the battle upon the industrial field. But here is the situation: The few Socialists who are in the trades union movement have been preaching industrial unionism long before some of the most earnest advocates of it now ever thought of it. And the Socialists in the trades union movement, as I know full well, are generally the ones who are the first to feel the black-list lash of the combined capitalist forces of the United States. They are the first to be opposed by capitalism. Secondly, they are generally secretly or openly opposed by old line trades unionists. Thirdly, our own Socialist friends are indifferent to the struggles of the Socialists who are fighting for industrialism in the trades union movement, and go home and refuse to fight the fight that will be necessary to establish industrialism upon the industrial field of America.

DEL. McDEVITT (Cal.): I am the only member of the Western Federation of Miners who has tried to get the floor.

I want first to point out to this convention that Comrade Hunter's argument was directed entirely to some amendment that might have been but has not been made. There has been no attempt nor desire to dictate to anybody. Comrade Hunter's knowledge of language must be as keen as mine and he must realize the important distinction between pointing out and dictating. And I want to point to him now—I am sorry if this is dictation—I want to point out to him that the amendment says specifically, "But we realize that it is the duty of the Socialist Party to point out to the workers—that is, to point out to those people to whom we are obliged to point out all that we know of the Socialist philosophy in the political and industrial field."

Comrade Hayes says that we have been preaching industrial unionism lo,

those many years. Yes, and I say it is our duty to continue to preach industrial unionism; and now, when the issue of industrial unionism is really made, now when the issue is up, is this the time to discontinue to preach industrial unionism? All this amendment asks is a declaration of our realization that it is our duty to point out that we believe in the industrial form of organization as best suited to working class solidarity (that is needed for success in the industrial struggles of labor under the present concentrated methods of production. Do we believe that? Every Socialist in the party knows that is the case. Why not declare it, then, to those who don't know it? The resolution of the committee covers the entire ground, except the one most important feature of the whole case. There is absolutely no declaration whatever as to the principle of industrial unionism, as to the principle of the industrial form of organization. This, it seems to me, is the last that we can do. We should at least declare that we realize it is our duty to stand for industrial solidarity in the industrial field as well as political solidarity in the political field.

This is not the last time that we shall hear of the principle of industrial unionism, nor is it the first time we have heard of it. But this is the time, comrades of this convention, for us to say at least that we realize that it is our duty to continue as we have done, and we propose from now on to continue to point out to the workers wherever we meet the workers the necessity of solidarity wherever they are organized industrially or politically.

DEL. STURTON (Mich.): I am unable to understand the logic by which a convention of a working class political party that went out of its way to pass a resolution on the subject of temperance can be said to be going out of its proper sphere of activity to pass a resolution on the subject of labor organizations as contemplated in this amendment. We have not gone out of our way and are not proposing to go out of our way in expressing ourselves as to our preference for one form of labor organization rather than another. We are not going out of our way to take up this subject. We find it in our way and we have to take it up. There is no subject more vital today with relation to this whole work-

ing class movement than the question of labor organizations, on which we find two contending forces here.

For this reason I deem the amendment highly proper, that there is not a Socialist in the world today who can indicate, even with a relative degree of clearness, how we can bring about the co-operative commonwealth except along the lines suggested by the amendment, and that is by the industrial organization of the workers. Political institutions are not adapted to the administration of industry. Only industrial organizations are adapted to the administration of the affairs of the co-operative commonwealth that we are working for. Only the industrial form of organization offers us even a theoretical constructive Socialist program. There is no constructive Socialism except in industrial unionism.

I was also sorry to think that this convention would be swayed very largely in the matter of refraining even from pointing out the superiority of the industrial form of organization—I should be very sorry to think that we should be swayed by opportunist considerations, that by refusing to point this out we should get more votes. I should be sorry if that were the case. It would be the very essence of opportunism, and Bryanism and Hearstism. I know of no argument that can be brought to this convention in favor of our absolute silence on this matter, other than that offered by the delegates who intimate that we can get more votes by being absolutely silent. I know of no argument along that line that has not already been worn threadbare by those who speak in the name of Bryan and Hearst, when they say we should keep out of the Socialist movement because we have no hope of electing a Socialist president, and why not support us and elect good men, and after a while Bryanism and Hearstism will evolve into Socialism. Bye and bye! I recognize the parallelism between those arguments. They are one and the same argument. And bearing in mind all these propositions, the amendment simply points out the fact, calls attention to the fact, and we are not going outside of our proper sphere and are not leaving our particular line of activity. Our broad line of activity is to destroy capitalist institutions and bring in the co-operative commonwealth. Very well! Here we find at our hand the means of

advancing constructive Socialism. I submit that we are not going outside our proper sphere in recognizing that these are the appropriate means, and they are at hand.

DEL. LEE (N. Y.): I have first to say one word in reply to the delegate who spoke just before me. It is not perhaps in the best of taste, or in the best of comradely feeling, or in the best interests of this convention, that a delegate who rises to support a certain motion should charge those who oppose it with being influenced only by a desire to get votes. I repeat that charge as being absolutely false. We are here to stand for what we believe to be the right position of the Socialist Party.

Now, comrades, let me call your attention, in the first place, to the hedge-podge that you would make of this resolution if you adopt this amendment. You first declare that the Socialist Party recognizes the necessity of the autonomy of the union movement in the economic field, just as it maintains its own autonomy in the political field; and then you go on to say that notwithstanding this, we tell you union men that you ought to organize your unions on such and such a plan.

I wonder what the comrades would say if at a convention of the American Federation of Labor they should adopt a resolution telling us how the Socialist Party should govern ourselves, telling us that we ought to overthrow our state autonomy rule, or that we ought to uphold our state autonomy rule, or telling us anything that we ought to do in our struggle for political supremacy. We would tell the American Federation of Labor to attend to their business in the economic field and we would attend to our business in the political field.

We stand for just what we say there. As I said introducing this resolution, we hold that it is not the business of this party to tell union workingmen how they should be organized or how they should act as unionists. It is our business to support them in their fights against their capitalist opponents. It is our business to help to make Socialists of them on the political field.

On the other hand, it is not the business of the American Federation of

Labor, or the Western Federation of Miners, or the Industrial Workers of the World, to tell us how we shall manage or should manage our affairs in the political field. It is their business, when they understand that it is to their interest to do so, to support us in the political field, and to organize, to bring about the best methods of action in their own field that they possibly can in view of all the experience that they have there.

Comrades, I want a consistent declaration sent out. I want a declaration sent out here that the world will know is a declaration for workingmen wherever they are struggling in any organization. (Long continued applause.)

I want a declaration sent out that cannot be used by Mr. Gompers to attack the Industrial Workers of the World; and I want a resolution that cannot be used, in the name of the Socialist Party, by the Industrial Workers of the World to attack the American Federation of Labor. (Loud applause.) We know this, comrades, that the Supreme Court of the United States, President Roosevelt, the Employers' Associations, and the Republican and Democratic parties are not fighting any particular labor organization. We recognize the fact that the capitalist organizations of this country and their friends, and their courts, and their soldiers, and their president, are not using their law and order methods against one form of labor organization. They are using them against the Western Federation of Miners, and they are using them against the American Federation of Labor; and, comrades, we stand for both against the capitalists.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt this amendment. Those in favor of that motion will say aye; those opposed, no. The ones have it.

(Cries of "Division!")

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the amendment will raise their hands and keep them up until counted. Those who are opposed raise their hands. The amendment has been lost by a vote of 48 in favor and 138 against.

The committee's report was then adopted.

Adjourned until 2 o'clock p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Clark called the convention to order at 2 o'clock p. m.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Resolutions Committee is ready to finish its report, and if there is no objection we will hear it.

DEL. SPARGO, reporting for Committee on Resolutions: Comrade Chairman and comrades, the Resolutions Committee has a number of important resolutions to report to the convention. Some of the resolutions are so important that I hope we shall be able to secure very close attention to the report. To get rid of some of the minor matters first—that is, matters upon which there will be less division of opinion—here is a resolution which to the delegates of the several states is a matter of almost vital importance to our organization. I will read it:

OPPRESSIVE PRIMARY LAWS.

"Whereas, In several states, through the operation of discriminating primary laws, minority parties are practically disfranchised and their resources are drained by the exaction of excessive and prohibitory fees; and

"Whereas, Individual states are unable to pay both the fees and the cost of fighting the law, therefore be it

"Resolved, That this convention recommends to the National Executive Committee that the national organization give such aid as is consistent with party finance to states that are trying to have these laws declared unconstitutional."

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of that resolution.

The motion was seconded and the resolution adopted.

DEPRECATION OF VIOLENCE.

DEL. SPARGO: A resolution relating to the matter of violence and physical force in the working class movement:

"The present industrial depression has reduced a large number of men and women to acute distress through lack of employment, and many of these, not

knowing how to express their indignation and revolt, are easily led by detectives, police and other agents of the capitalist class into acts of violence.

"We hold that any such violence on the part of the working people not only results in injuring their cause, but in helping the ruling class to maintain its power."

"We therefore urge all who desire the triumph of the working class to refrain from violence and from words inciting to violence, and to put all their energy into the economic fight waged by the unions, and the political fight waged by the Socialist Party." (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of that resolution. (Seconded.)

DEL. O'NEILL (Wyo.): I would like to move to amend that resolution so as to make it show that we want to use our judgment in handling our affairs so as not to incite violence, instead of making it appear that the laboring class at present is represented by us as inciting to violence.

THE CHAIRMAN: Won't you please formulate your amendment just as you want it, if you desire to make an amendment?

DEL. O'NEILL: Well, that is the sense of it. I want that to appear, that the Socialist Party is working to educate the laborers so that they will not resort to violence.

DEL. SPARGO: The chairman of the committee would suggest to the comrade that that is specifically provided in the resolution itself.

The motion to adopt the resolution was then carried.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I want to be recording as voting no on this resolution; Slobodin of New York.

TYRANNICAL ACTS AGAINST MEXICAN LABOR LEADERS.

DEL. SPARGO: Another resolution:

"Whereas, The leaders of the working class revolt in Mexico against economic and political tyranny, having been driven from Mexico by threats of im-

prisonment and death for their devotion to working class interests in connection with a certain uprising and other revolts of the workers against the master class; and

"Whereas, These men have been arrested in this country without warrant of law and held in jail for nearly a year on trumped-up charges of conspiracy to organize an armed force to invade Mexico; and

"Whereas, This persecution of labor leaders by the capitalist class of the republics of the United States and Mexico constitutes an assault upon the entire working class of both countries, menacing such political rights as the workers still retain; be it therefore

"Resolved, That we condemn the action of the officials of both countries, and pledge our support to the defense of Magon, Villeral, Rivera and Sarabia against the persecution of the master class."

On behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of that resolution. (Seconded.)

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): I am not speaking against the resolution, but I would like to get some information, either from the committee or from the comrades who want to introduce the resolution. I notice that the name Sarabia is mentioned in the resolution. Sarabia used to publish a Spanish paper in St. Louis, but he had no connection whatever with the—

THE CHAIRMAN: Please state what information it is you desire.

DEL. HOEHN: Well, before I can ask for the information I must give you my information, so that I can get the proper answer. But while in St. Louis he had no connection whatever with the Socialist Party, nor did he have any connection with organized labor. I should like to know in what relation those three men stand to the Socialist Party or the labor movement in California, before I vote on this question.

DEL. SPARGO: The chairman of the Resolutions Committee desires to state that the information asked for can best be given by Comrade Johns of California.

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): Sarabia, Villeral, Rivera and Magon are not connected with the Socialist Party nor with the labor union movement of California, but all four of these men have given

their best energies and very nearly their lives in an attempt to organize labor in a country where labor organizations practically have been impossible because of the tyranny of the master class in that country. Sarabia was secretary of the organization in this country after the failure of what is known as the Menol uprising; and the Menol movement was an attempt to organize the Mexican miners, and was altogether a feeble movement, but the opinion of Colonel W. C. Green was that it would tend to riot.

At the time the organization began, the importation of Pinkerton detectives from this country to provoke riot was begun. At the same time there was gathered in Arizona a number of men under the generalship of—it doesn't matter, a deserter from the German army—who was employed by Colonel W. C. Green to organize a force on the border of Arizona to be ready to invade Mexico at the time the Mexican government or the sovereign of Sonora in Mexico should call for aid against the uprising that was being engineered by Colonel Green and General Fieston and the other men interested in the Menol mines. The stocks were sold at that time for what could be got for them. Then began stories telling of alleged friction between the Mexican miners and the American miners, and then when the revolt finally was forced by the trouble makers, by the hired Pinkertons, reports went out which had been carefully prepared for by advance information. A report went out that there was a clash between the Mexican miners and the Americans in Sonora.

Also it was stated in the papers that Mexico was in a state of revolution, and then the use that was made of that revolution was to buy back the stock that had been sold at a high price, to buy them back for about 10 per cent of what they were sold for. That is the history of the Menol uprising, in brief. It was used to turn the minds of the American workers against the Mexican workers so that at any time the political uprising should come in Mexico to throw off the rule of the masters and make labor union organization possible in Mexico it would be easy to get volunteers for the American army that was to invade Mexico and fight against the possibility of organizing labor in any

way in the republic of Mexico. These men are not members of labor organizations in the United States, but they are the leaders of the movement to organize labor in Mexico. One of the men arrested, Comrade Villeral, was for more than two years a member of the Socialist Party in Los Angeles, but asked for his release. His feeling, and that of every other Mexican Socialist who has come from Mexico, has been that this labor union, this revolt as a means of organizing labor, is the only movement possible in Mexico. Effort after effort has been made to organize a Socialist movement there, and it has been ruthlessly stamped out. Whenever the Mexican Socialists go from California to Mexico they join the Liberal party there because it is the only movement possible for them in the fight to gain the privilege of organization at any time for the welfare of the working class.

DEL. HOEHN: The information is satisfactory, and I hope the resolution will be adopted unanimously.

The question was put on the adoption of the resolution, and it was carried unanimously.

IMMIGRATION.

DEL. SPARGO: The next resolution is on the question of immigration. The chairman desires to say that on this question of immigration the report of your committee is a unanimous one. There was a very sharp dividing line in the committee upon the question, as I presume there would be in any number of Socialists gathered together. There was submitted to the Resolutions Committee a definite resolution looking to the endorsement of the principle of Asiatic exclusion. There was a good deal of protest against it. Your committee took the position of trying to find a middle ground upon which all could agree, and invited both sides of the issue to appear before it. In addition to that, they have taken into consultation a large number of delegates who have pronounced views upon the matter. I make this announcement merely to say that this resolution which I am to read is not merely by unanimous consent the agreement of the committee, but that the partisans on both sides, the extremists on both sides of the question of immigration, have agreed to it as being a satisfactory statement to make at this time at this convention. Therefore, it

is our hope that what seemed to be a matter which would involve us in endless debate may be disposed of very promptly. I ask your attention while I read the resolution:

"The Socialist Party, in convention assembled, declares that the fundamental principle of Socialism is the struggle between the exploiting and exploited classes. The controlling principle of the political Socialist movement is the economic interest of the workers.

"In conformity with this principle the National Convention of the Socialist Party affirms that the working class must protect itself against whatever imperils its economic interests. The mass importation by the capitalist class of foreign workers with lower standard of living than those generally prevailing may in some instances become as serious to the working class of the nation as an armed invasion would be to the nation itself.

"To deny the right of the workers to protect themselves against injury to their interests, caused by the competition of imported foreign laborers whose standards of living are materially lower than their own, is to set a bourgeois Utopian ideal above the class struggle.

"This principle compels us to resolutely oppose all immigration which is subsidized or stimulated by the capitalist class, and all contract labor immigration, as well as to support all attempts of the workers to raise their standards of living. It does not, however, commit the Socialist Party to any attitude upon specific legislation looking to the exclusion of any race or races as such.

"The question of racial differences involved in the agitation for the exclusion of Asiatic immigrants this convention does not feel itself competent to decide upon at this time in the absence of a scientific investigation of the matter.

"Therefore, we recommend that in view of the great importance of this subject to the life of the workers of the nation, a special committee of five members be elected at this convention to carefully study and investigate the whole subject of immigration, in all its aspects, racial no less than economic, to publish from time to time such data as they may gather, and to report to the next convention of the party."

The reading of the resolution was followed with applause.

DEL. SPARGO: Mr. Chairman, I move, on behalf of the committee, the adoption of that resolution. (Seconded.)

DEL. WOODBRY (Cal.): It is generally supposed that the western people, those living on the Pacific slope, are almost as a unit opposed to Oriental immigration. I am not saying that those living on the western slope oppose them, but where Oriental immigration comes to the western coast it is supposed that the people of the west are in favor of their exclusion. I am in favor of throwing the entire world open to the inhabitants of the world. (Applause.) There are no foreigners, and cannot be unless some person came down from Mars, or Jupiter, or some place. I stand on the declaration of Thomas Paine when he said "The world is my country." (Applause.) It would be a curious state of affairs for immigrants or the descendants of immigrants from Europe themselves to get control of affairs in this country, and then say to the Oriental immigrants that they should not come here. So far as making this a mere matter of race, I disagree decidedly with the committee, that we need any kind of a committee to decide this matter from a scientific standpoint. We know what we think upon the question of race now as well as we would know two years from now or any other time.

And so far as reducing the standard of living is concerned, the standard of living will be reduced anyhow. You know, as well as I do that either the laborer will be brought to the job or the job will be taken to the laborer. Understand? We will either have to produce things as cheap as they can be produced upon foreign soil or the means of production will be carried to the Orient and there the thing will be done. The natural tendency of capitalism is to reduce the standard of living; the standard of living will be reduced anyhow.

Now, listen: It seems to me if we take any stand opposed to any sort of immigration that we are simply playing the old petting trick of the Democrats and Republicans, and will gain nothing by it. (Applause.) I believe it is opposed, as I understand, to the principles of international Socialism. I do not pretend to say that the international Socialist organization takes square ground as to what we should say on the question, but to me Socialism is based,

if anything, upon the Brotherhood of Man. This stand that we take in opposition to any sort of immigration is opposed to the very spirit of the Brotherhood of Man. I hope, therefore, that all that part of the committee's report which imposes a restriction on immigration will be stricken out by this convention. It ought to be done; in good faith it ought to be done, because, in the first place, the Socialists are organized in Japan; they are getting organized in China; they will soon be operating in every civilized nation on earth. And are the Socialists of this country to say to the Socialists of Germany, or the Socialists of Sweden, Norway, Japan, China, or any other country, that they are not to go anywhere on the face of the earth? It seems to me absurd to take that position. Therefore, I hope and move that any sort of restriction of immigration will be stricken out of the committee's resolution. (Applause.)

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): Comrade Chairman, there is another thing that is to be considered in the question of immigration, and that is the class struggle, and that any action on the part of the working class which is in accord with the actions and intentions and interests of the capitalist class is in direct conflict with the interests of the workers (Applause.) And whenever you take any action that puts your sanction upon the efforts of the manufacturers to bring the hordes of either Europe or Asia to this soil you take your stand for the lowering of civilization. (Applause.)

I want to say to you, my comrades, that brotherhood means something more than a mere mouthing of phrases about that question. There are some limits to be considered. We know the purpose of the mass importation of foreign labor. It is to bring American labor down to the same miserable standard which they occupy. I want to say to you again, on questions of that kind take men of the highest intellectual standard of the working classes of Europe, and they will stay at home to lead the fight in their own country, where they understand the problem and can aid the most in bringing about the brotherhood of man. You and I know that strong, able, intellectual men acquainted with their surroundings at home, among their people, can accomplish vastly more for the uplifting of those people than they can do when

they come a few thousand miles away, in a strange country, surrounded by strange conditions and people speaking a strange language.

I want to say to you again, on the question of immigration, that there are biological reasons as well as sociological and economic ones to be considered upon this matter. (Applause.) There has never been a mixture and amalgamation of races that did not end disastrously for those amalgamated. (Applause.)

And I want to say to you that it is capitalism that fosters and creates conditions of that kind. People that belong to the same race, unless there are economic reasons for mingling with others, naturally draw those lines pretty closely, and while they may cross those lines in associating and in exchanging ideas, still their life is spent among the people of a common descent. I take it that no mere sentiments or ideals of the present can wipe out the result of centuries of blood and thought and struggle. There are some things along that line that we must consider very carefully. Remember, above all things else, the class struggle lies at the bottom of the Socialist propaganda. It seems to me sometimes that we forget that, in the mouthing of mere sentimental phrases. True, we want also to promote the brotherhood of man. How can we do that? Not by sinking mankind to a common level. The delegate says we will have to take the man to the job or the job will go to the man. I want to tell him he will have to change some of nature's laws before he can take the ore out of the Rocky Mountains to the Chinaman (applause), or before he can bring the coal out of Illinois, out of Pennsylvania, and take it over to the Jap, or to the Greek to dig. It is true that this transporting can be done in some of the phases of manufacturing, in textile operations, etc. But let us look at all questions of this kind calmly and considerately. Above all, we must solve the problems of the people of our own country. This problem comes to us with the most pressing weight, and other men in other countries will meet their problems as best they may. The working class of the world has a common purpose, a common cause, but that does not mean that we shall ignore or neglect these great primal facts. It does not mean at any stage of the game that we shall ever clasp hands

with the employer and seek to give our aid to the aims which he seeks to achieve. It is disastrous to the working class whenever that is the result. I think we would do well to appoint a committee upon this question. I am very nearly in complete accord with the report of the Resolutions Committee. Perhaps I would have gone a little bit farther on the question of Asiatic immigration and Asiatic civilization.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Comrades, I endorse the first part of the committee's report. I oppose the second part. In the first part of the report the committee states something definite; certain facts are presented. In the second part, in the concluding part of the report, the recommendation is made that no action be taken today, but that we defer final action to four years hence, to our next National Convention. Now, I wish to inform the members of the committee and the delegates on the floor of the convention that the class struggle will not be fought in the co-operative commonwealth in twenty-five or fifty or a hundred years from now, but the class struggle is here today and you will have to fight it today. (Applause.)

DEL. SPARGO: A point of order. The report does nothing of the kind that Delegate Hoehn suggests. The part that we propose to take definite action on is the class struggle. On the disputed question of racial antagonism as distinct from the class struggle, we say, "Let us study that first." We do not propose to postpone the class struggle.

DEL. HOEHN: Well, I stand corrected to that extent. But, nevertheless, I want to impress upon the minds of the delegates to this convention that today the class struggle in this country is on.

DEL. SPARGO: We recognize that. DEL. HOEHN: The class struggle is on today, and with the permission of my friend from Illinois, Comrade Lewis, I will say the class struggle is on between capitalism and the working class. (Laughter.)

DEL. LEWIS: You are responsible, and not me.

DEL. HOEHN: Now, as Comrade Miller from Colorado has very properly pointed out, whenever the capitalist class, whenever the American Manufacturers' Association, and the Citizens' Industrial Alliance stand for a certain demand, organized labor and the Socialists

of the country ought to be very careful not to fall in line with those corporation representatives. I assure you that nothing would be more welcome today to the American capitalistic corporations than to open the gates on all sides and admit the millions and millions of poor slaves into this country, so that the capitalists could break up every labor union in the country. And I want to say right here, comrades, it would only require about 250,000 Japanese mine workers to be imported in a few months to break up the entire United Mine Workers' Union of America. We as Socialists cannot stand for such a proposition. The Socialist convention, before it adjourns, must take definite action. It has to consider the demand made by the great mass of organized workers. Now, I want to refer to our friend from California. I have noticed that whenever an important question is up our friends from California stand on the class struggle, but unfortunately for our comrades from California, they do not stand on the class struggle, nor do they sit on the class struggle; they are lying on the class struggle, and lying up in the air. (Laughter.) And I want to say to you that the class struggle in Los Angeles, and the class struggle in the State of Washington, is going on fiercer than in any part of the United States, and our comrades on the Pacific coast will have to take a little different stand on such an important proposition.

DEL. YOUNG (Pa.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, when we go into a skin game we must play the game in accordance with the rules of the game. When we go into the game of capitalism we must play that game in accordance with the rules of capitalism. If we try to inaugurate the great and noble ideas of Socialism in a capitalist community, just as surely as we are in the class struggle we are going to be ground under the wheels of this capitalist juggernaut.

Now, there was a law made before the law of the class struggle, and that was the law of self-preservation. Every workingman in this country is first bound by the law of self-preservation, and if immigration of foreign peoples who are below the standard of living in the United States is allowed to swamp this country with cheap labor from all over the world, just so sure will the

standard of living of the workingmen of the United States be reduced. Now, that is not a theory; it is not an opinion; it is a fact. And it is with facts that we have at this time got to grapple. Personally, I would be in favor of absolutely stopping all immigration into this country. (Hisses and manifestations of disapproval.) I think it would be the best thing for the American worker.

(Cries of "Sit down.")
DEL. YOUNG: Have I the floor, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have order until the comrade closes.

DEL. YOUNG: But the report of this committee I take as a most admirable report, and I can only urge with all the power that I have the adoption of that report. And the moment that we take an extreme ground on either side, either for the unlimited influx of labor from foreign countries or for the absolute exclusion of foreign peoples, why, that moment we will come into clash with either the labor interests of this country or the labor interests of outside countries. But our first duty is to the laboring class, the working class of the United States, and not to that of Europe or China, or any other country under the sun. We are here to represent the working class of the United States, and we are bound to do the best we can for the working class of the United States. I strongly urge the adoption of this resolution.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): Undoubtedly the hissing that was done here a few minutes ago is a good example of those advocates of brotherly love who wish to bring that brotherly love while the class struggle is going on; a very good example. It proves the statement of my friend, Comrade Young of Pennsylvania, that not only is the first law of life, namely, the law of self-preservation, the main law, the main material law, but when it comes to the self-preservation of one's personal ideas the law of human nature, and we do not remember our brotherly love to our fellow men when anybody crosses us in our ideas. (Applause.)

The brotherhood of man is for a future state of society. While my friend from California is talking about the brotherhood of man, thinking about the brotherhood of man, dreaming about the brotherhood of man, the capitalist

class is doing something else. (Applause.) The capitalist class don't talk only or think or dream about the brotherhood of man. The capitalist class has its eyes upon the working class. The capitalist class has got its eyes not only upon the working class of America, but also upon the working class of foreign lands. The capitalist class is a class which wishes to preserve not only its ultimate interests, but also its immediate interests, and the capitalist class will preserve its immediate interests by importing not only labor into America, but by exporting its industries to foreign lands. Now, we are not concerned as to whether or not the capitalist will export its industries into foreign lands—but we are confronted with the fact as to whether or not the capitalist class will import foreign labor into the United States right now. There is nothing more to be said, because our friend—(laughter)—I don't yield the floor yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade has the floor.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: There is nothing more to be said—

A DELEGATE: Then sit down.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us have order till the comrade finishes.

A DELEGATE: A point of order. He said there is nothing more to be said, so why doesn't he sit down?

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have to ask him about it.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Comrade Young of Pennsylvania and Comrade Miller of Colorado have stated fully the position of those who are in favor of exclusion, and anything more on my part would seem simply to be repetition, but I wanted to make that one point, the fact that the brotherhood of man has no place in a capitalist society in which the class struggle is the main factor.

DEL. SMITH (Tex.): There is no doubt but that there may be a great deal said on both sides of this question by parties holding extreme views. There might be a great deal said. Now, we have heard from Pennsylvania and from Washington. I am from Texas, a sort of middle ground, you know, yet I have got very decided views. The resolution does not conform to all my views fully, but I am charmed with the wisdom set forth in that resolution, and I believe that it will have a tendency to harmonize

all parties. Now, I first started into the business, the harmonizing business—

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): I rise to a point of personal privilege; that we have heard four speeches in favor of the resolution and only one against.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of personal privilege is not well taken.

DEL. HERMAN: I ask that we find out the position that the delegate rising is going to take.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not a mind reader.

DEL. SMITH: About thirty-five years ago, having been born and raised south of this city a few miles, I went down south, married a Mississippi girl, and settled the question between the North and South. And now, if we can harmonize the East and West on this question we will be doing a great thing, and I do not believe if we were to fight two hours over this question we would come any nearer than is to be found in that resolution. I stand for the resolution.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and fellow delegates, I am in favor of the resolution proposed by the committee. It does not go as far as I would like it to go, but I believe it goes as far as it is possible to carry this convention. The principal argument made in favor of exclusion is that oriental immigration would lower civilization, in the language of Comrade Miller. I have lived some four years on the Pacific slope, visited all its principal cities and enjoyed the hospitality of most of its japs, and I have come into contact with the orientals in those cities. You cannot get a Chinese cook on the Pacific coast for less than nearly double the wages of a white cook. (Applause.) When you talk to a Chinaman about cooking there is only one phrase he will consent to mention to you, and that is "seventy dolls month," and he will not work for \$69. You can get white cooks in ship loads at \$30 or \$40 a month. In the city of Bellingham, on the northern part of the Pacific coast, there is the largest salmon cannery in the world, operated by white men. There is only about three months of the year of a season, and they only work about two or three days a week. During that season, when the white wage slaves began to protest that at least during the season they ought to be paid double time, for they were there

day and night for two days a week, the employers responded by bringing a shipload of Chinamen from San Francisco to take their places. The Chinamen were shrewd enough to contract that unless they decided to stay they would be shipped back. They came; they worked less than one week, and then they issued their manifesto to the employers, and they said: "During the season we are willing to work two days and two nights when the catch is in, and loaf the rest of the week. But, working or loafing, from the beginning of the season to the conclusion our wages must be paid for every day, or we go back." (Applause.) And the employers said, "That is a bigger demand than the white men ever made," and they took the Chinamen back to San Francisco.

A DELEGATE: Good for the Chinamen!

DEL. LEWIS: As for the Jap, the Japanese workers of southern California, on the railroads applied to the American Federation of Labor for a charter. These men are willing to organize, and once they become familiar with the country they would make better organized workmen than the white man. (Applause.) No Chinaman ever breaks a contract twice, and very rarely once. These men applying for a charter were refused one by the representatives of organized labor in America—one of the most treasurable acts ever committed in the name of the working class. (Applause.) I have only one minute and a half. I want to tell Comrade Wagenknecht that is only possible in a capitalist society. True, we can not invite all men to unite, because we are divided into classes, but we can invite all the workers of all the world to unite. (Applause.) As for me, on this question class runs deeper than either blood or race (applause), and I say to the Japanese workman and the Japanese Socialist looking across the Pacific to this convention and asking, shall we include them with our European workmen and consider them a part of the Socialist international movement, this is my answer: We are exploited with a common exploitation; we are enslaved in a common slavery; and so far as I am concerned, my yellow working wage slaves and comrades, we will stand or fall together. (Applause.)

DEL. UNTERMANN (Idaho). I be-

lieve in the international solidarity of the working class, and yield to no Socialist on this floor in teaching and practicing such solidarity to the point to which it is possible. But I do not believe in international solidarity to the point of cutting my own throat. So long as this question is discussed merely from the economic point of view, we necessarily come to one set of conclusions; we turn in a circle and get nowhere. Every Socialist writer of any authority has always declared that the Socialist Party considers not merely the economic point of view, but all phases of social life. But when the race question comes into discussion this reasonable declaration is quickly forgotten and the whole debate turns upon the economic factor, without taking the slightest notice of the racial aspect of this question. This is not only an economic question, but also a race question, and I am not afraid to say so. I believe in the authority of the International Congress, but I do not believe in international dogma. The International Congress is not a church council whose declaration we must accept willingly or unwillingly. I am not going to submit to the mere theoretical declarations of a set of European intellectuals who have never had any actual touch with the race issue. Those comrades who merely consider the economic point of view forget that every argument that can be brought against oriental exclusion from that point of view can also be brought against the immigration of any other race. Only when we take the race issue into consideration along with the economic factors do we get to any satisfactory solution of this question.

I want to ask those comrades who believe in unrestricted immigration of the orientals why they do not demand a vote and homesteads for them? If they demand a vote for the orientals, what will be the consequence for the Socialist Party? Every one familiar with conditions in the southern states knows very well what would be the fate of the Socialist Party if we attempted to organize mixed locals of colored and white people down there. Every one familiar with conditions on the Pacific and in the Rocky Mountain states knows that the same result would follow there if we attempted to organize mixed locals of orientals and whites. The oriental la-

borers are of no use to us in our political struggle, even if we could organize them and educate them as easily as laborers from other countries. The orientals have no home. They cannot help to fight the political class struggle, and if we demand homesteads for them what will be the result for the white race? How much of the United States are you going to turn over to them? And if they fill them up, how much more and how much more?

I am determined that my race shall not go the way of the Aztec and the Indian. I believe in the brotherhood of man, regardless of races, but I do not believe in extending that brotherhood to the point of eliminating myself voluntarily from the struggle for existence and turning over this country to my brothers of other races. I am determined that my race shall be supreme in this country and in the world. (Applause.)

For this reason I am in favor of the adoption of the report of the committee, and in favor of the appointment of a committee which shall study this question. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, whatever I may have done, I have not taken up very much of your time so far, and I am not going to take up much of your time. (A voice, "Good.") I am not going to make a long speech. I may not even want five minutes. But we do not want to decide this question on second-hand ideas. The Socialist movement, the International movement, was not founded on second-hand reasons. It does not rest on second-hand reasons. Our basis is materialistic. Our basis is scientific. Let us decide this question as we do every other question, on a scientific and materialistic basis. I will not go over any of the ground that the others have covered. I fully agree with everything that Guy Miller said, and I fully agree with what Comrade Hoehn and some of the others said.

There are about 500,000,000 Chinamen in China. We get now about a million immigrants from Europe. They are of our own race and make-up, in a measure, and yet aren't they lowering the standard of living for the American proletariat? Anybody who tells me that they do not is deceiving himself and he is deceiving us. They do. But we know that in the second generation they will

become part of us, that they will become the same as we are. A good many of them become part of us even in the first generation, for they are of the same make-up and they have the same civilization. There is very little difference between the German workman coming over here and the American workman. The main difference is in language. A good many of our German comrades know a good deal more than we do; in some respects we may even learn from some of our Russian comrades. (Applause.)

But, comrades, the Asiatic question is entirely different. The Asiatics, while their civilization may be older, while they may be smarter, than the American or European—that is so much more reason—

(Confusion on the convention floor.)

DEL. BERGER: Comrades, I have listened to you, and I want you to listen to me. On the contrary, if their adaptability is so much greater and their needs are so much smaller than ours, that is the more reason why we have to defend ourselves. This is a practical question for the working class. China could send over about two million coolies every year and not feel it. They could send over here five millions every year if our capitalists should want them, and China would not miss them. But we would feel it. If you permit them to come over here just for fifteen years at two millions a year you will wipe out our civilization simply by their lower standard of living, by their power to live on a great deal less than you can. There would be a quiet war, but a most terrible war, waged against us—a war of extermination, on economic lines. The white race could not propagate, could not exist in a competition of that kind with the yellow race. That is all I have to say on this.

I want to consider this simply from a working class standpoint, and no other. We are willing to help the Japs in every way; we are willing to help the Chinese in every way. By pulling us down to their level they do not help themselves in any way, but they make us miserable. Your first duty, comrades, is to your class and to your family. Because your neighbor's house is burning, shall you set your own house on fire? No, say I. Defend your own house and then help your neighbor; that is the way.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I am go-

ing to try to keep as close to the main topic, the resolution, as possible. We can make academic speeches here, those of us who are able, for the time to come, and two days longer, on this question, and will then, perhaps, not have reached the matter that is before us. I admit everything that has been said relative to the brotherhood of man when taken upon its equitable basis, but I am forced to remind you of the story of the old champion abolitionist, Wendell Phillips, and the minister. The minister said, "I understand, Mr. Phillips, that you advocate the freedom of the black man." "Yes, I do," said Phillips. "Then why don't you go down south and preach it?" Phillips turned to him and said, "You are a minister, and I presume you believe in hell." "Oh, yes," "Wouldn't you like to see hell abolished?" "Yes," said the preacher. "Then," said Phillips, "why don't you go to hell and preach it?" (Laughter.)

I am reminded by you that our basis is the brotherhood of man, and I agree to it. But I want to remind you again that you can no more practice it, even though you do your best, until you remove the obstacles to the practice of it. You can no more practice it now than it would be possible to go up the side of a volcano. If I understand the resolution it distinctly states that we are in opposition to contract labor and not to voluntary immigration. If an immigrant is dissatisfied with his country and comes to America because he wants to come, there is no objection to that in that resolution; let him come. But, Mr. Chairman and comrades, when the American capitalists can do as they have done in the past, pass an appropriation of \$64,000 through the legislature or through the Congress, to pay for advertisements to be sent to Europe to bring immigrants here, advertisements that lie as to the conditions, and bring them here by hundreds of thousands to promote the interests of the capitalists, do you tell me then that we shall agree on the theory of the brotherhood of man, that we shall agree and accept that proposition? I say, if we do, it is not wise on our part, neither are we promoting in an elementary or any other manner the brotherhood of man. It is simply foolishness on our part. Contract labor, as I understand, is read distinctly in that resolution. If that is true, I am in favor of the resolution. If it had said in

broad, general terms, as some comrades have, that they are opposed to all immigration, I could understand all that, and I would be opposed to the resolution. But in this struggle of which you have said so much and so eloquently, the capitalists are out to do a certain thing, and we disagree and I disagree that they should do that thing in that way. Every immigrant, German, Asiatic, Caucasian, or whatever he may be, I do not care what he is, may be permitted to come to America if he comes on his own volition and with his own means, and rest assured I shall welcome him to the best of my ability, because if he is dissatisfied and comes here he makes a pretty good citizen as soon as he gets here, and the man will be ready to go and fight the capitalists. But I say that the Russian who stays in Russia is doing more to bring Socialism in Russia than the same man could do if he came to America. (Applause.) I want to say to you that the Russians there are about ready to overturn the throne of the czar; don't forget it. If he voluntarily comes I welcome him; but when they bring them by the hundreds of thousands, then they are neither helping the Americans nor helping the Russians. That is the point I want to make, and with that point I am perfectly satisfied. You can see, I think, my position. Brother Lewis says we will rise or fall together. I agree to that. How shall we save ourselves? By agreeing to the capitalist methods, or adopting some of our own?

DEL. PEISER (N. Y.): Comrade Chairman and comrade delegates, my local has instructed me to speak upon this question, and to speak against the admission of coolie and contract labor. Now, there is a point that has not been brought out by the ardent adherents of the admission of Japanese and Chinese men on the Pacific slope, and that point is this: In Africa, Cape Colony, or where the mines are, they have admitted coolie and Chinese labor. Has the price of labor gone up in East Africa or has it declined? I ask the comrade from the Pacific coast that question. There are no coolie laborers working for \$70 a month there. No, Comrade Arthur Morrow Lewis, but they are working for a far lower wage than the original workers in the mines of East Africa. It has certainly tended to lower the standard

of living among the white workingmen of East Africa, that is a fact. It is not going up in the air, but it is sinking, from what I have read and from the information that we have got.

Furthermore, to speak of the brotherhood of man is a very nice thing. I am looking ardently forward to the time when there will be a brotherhood of man among all the world, but every time I think of it I am thinking of the person I remember reading of a preacher that went out to the Indians with a Bible in one hand, and so forth. He spoke of the brotherhood of man to the Indians, and the Indians got his scalp. Now, fellow delegates, this is the way with the white workingman in this country today. We can talk of the brotherhood of man, and they are going to get our economic scalps if we talk so much about it without giving them a chance to work out their own salvation. I am a descendant, or rather the son of a German who emigrated to this country, but I believe that we, the emigrants that emigrated to this country, of the white race, are today working for a higher standard among the working class, while the yellow races are not doing so, and therefore I am in favor of keeping coolie labor away from the American shores until such time as they have a higher standard of living, until the time that they have worked their way up to our standard today; and therefore, Comrade Chairman and delegates, I am in favor of the adoption of the resolution as read.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): I move an amendment to the resolution before the house. I move that this be incorporated with the resolution: We recognize that pending the success of the economic revolution on the political field, it may be wise and necessary to restrict immigration in order to protect labor from a complication from the Orient that proceeds from immigrants who do not enter this country for the purpose of establishing permanent homes. Do I obtain a second?

The amendment was seconded. DEL. MILLER: Let me first say to you that this thing is not in opposition to the international resolution adopted at Stuttgart. I have it in my hand for the purpose, and I want to read two lines of it in the first part of the conclusion to that resolution: "To advise and assist the bonafide working men in their efforts," etc.

Now, there is a difference between the people who come here from Germany, from Brother Berger's home, and the people who come from China and Japan. You know and Comrade Lewis knows that they are coming all the time, thousands and tens of thousands of men, workingmen, not to be our brothers in blood, of one nature by race, but they are coming to America, not to establish homes and become a part of the proletarian revolution in the United States, but to earn some money and go back to their native land (applause)—of their own volition, to enjoy what they have made here, earned in competition with white labor, to spend it in a land where it costs only a fraction of what it does here to live, and at the behest of their comrades to take up arms in a war for capitalist purposes between capitalist governments. Now, I say Brother Lewis knows something of the brotherhood of man. I know something of it myself. But I know that if you want to emancipate the labor movement in the west, just stand for the immigration of all the people from the orient, if you please, and you will do it, and you will satisfy the capitalist masters of the Union. (Applause.) I do not know that this question is a question between the east and west in the ranks of the Socialist party. It has been said here and intimated that it is. I do not know that it would hurt any of our comrades in the east if this amendment should fail, if this convention should declare against immigration from the east. There is a difference between the people of European countries who come here to make a home and to become part of our movement, and who before they come, many of them, have better ideas of the Socialist movement than we have, and, on the other hand, people who come from the orient, and who intend to go back, who never establish homes here, who are different in many respects from the immigrants from European countries, and who never do help us in any way, shape or manner to bring about the emancipation of the working class of America; and until we bring about the emancipation of the working class of America we shall not be in a strong position to help the working class of China.

DEL. BERYN (Ill.): It was some time ago that I came to this country. I am a foreigner. I remember that in 1850 in the streets of New York I saw

riots between the Know-nothings and the Widawakes, between those who were called the dark lantern men, who wanted to keep the foreigners out, and those who were in favor of a larger immigration. The argument on one side was that there were too many people in the country. We had at that time in the United States, according to the census, 31,000,000 people. We were told at that time that the standard of living would be reduced. But since that time the immigrants have come in an ever-increasing flow, but the organization of labor amongst the people has enabled the American workmen to do something to raise the standard of living, in spite of the immense inflow. That is one side of the question.

But there is another side of the question—that wonderful class struggle that these people talk about and know nothing about. We must keep separate from the capitalists. When the Chinese exclusion act was enacted there was not even a socialist party; don't forget that. I belong to a different race than nine-tenths of you here. I am not only a foreigner by birth, but I am a Jew, so exclude them all—they are no good. Now, let me tell you; we want to keep the class struggle. It is a remarkable thing; the oblivion of this convention is remarkable in one point. You don't know why the fleet of battleships has been sent to the Pacific. You forget all about that. You forget that both Democrats and Republicans are united on Japanese and Oriental exclusion, and you want us to blow the little whistle and say "Me, too." (Laughter and applause.) Now, I do not think that is the mission of the Socialist party. I believe in the resolution which says that a committee shall be appointed to investigate this matter, and even though we were to get that report inside of two years instead of four years, the exclusion acts will have been passed. There is, with all this talk about immigration, the most efficient exclusion act at work right now. The emigrants exceed the number of immigrants. (Applause.) If you want to exclude them, double up the force of the industrial depression. It is nonsensical to talk about people coming here because they come of their own free will. They utterly ignore the goad of the capitalist whip which sends the proletariat around the world. They ignore it. And then they want to tack

on a whole lot of stuff; investigate, and when the next convention comes the exclusion acts will be in full force. We won't elect socialists to the next congress, I am afraid, to affect the standing of the matter, for the unanimity of both capitalist parties on the question will settle the matter, for the coming of the sixteen battering rams that are floating in the Pacific will force them into silence, and we Socialists will proudly say they are doing our work. (Applause.) That is a great class struggle, if you want to chime in with the capitalists and say "Me, too." I have been in this country for sometime. I was here in the days when the abolition question was on, and when the enfranchisement question was up, and I am learning funny lessons. I have learned to look upon all men as equal. You may attempt in this body to make me unlearn it, but you cannot do it. (Applause.) I belong to a despised race. The idea of equality for all men regardless of race can only be accomplished by the Socialist party. (Applause.) But if we permit ourselves to go to work and tuck amendments to the proposition of "Workmen of all countries, unite"—if you tack amendments to that, then tack a clause to the name of the Socialist party, the words "A d— lie."

DEL. ESTER NIEMINEN (Minn.): This question is really a waste of time. We seem to think we have got a Socialist government already. If we Socialists had the management of the United States government, then there would be reason for talking as to whether it would be of any benefit to have the Chinese or not. But now the way it is, you know the capitalists control us and we cannot do anything. If we say we want to exclude Oriental immigration we cannot do it. If the capitalists want to bring them in, no trade union is strong enough to prevent it. If the capitalists cannot have immigration coming here, if they cannot have Chinamen come here they are going to take out their machinery and move their factories to China. That is what the great trusts are doing today. Even if the different unions become so strong that they cannot make their machinery here, that will make no difference, for the Europeans will then make the machinery. We know that if we try to stop it, if we do pass resolutions that we do not want the Chinaman here or

that we do not want the Japanese here, we know that if the capitalists think it is any benefit to them they will bring the Chinaman in.

But the capitalist class today realizes that it is more benefit to have European workmen here than it is to have Chinese workmen. Why? The American consumes more than a Chinaman, and the capitalist does not want any one that comes here and works and does not consume something. We undersell the Orientals and crowd them out of employment at home. Then they come here to seek work, but we good, honest Americans, and even some Socialists, want to starve them. And then we say all men are equal, of whatever color. Soon we will be saying all men are equal but Chinamen. I don't know where the women come in—I mean the Chinese women.

The only way we could reach a solution of this question would be through industrial unionism, and then we would be in danger of losing our dear capitalists, which is awful to think of. Our natural resources won't hold them here.

Another thing, if we do have the Chinaman it is not going to put the workman out of work. We have found out that the last panic has made more Socialists than anything else, and if all the Japanese came here tomorrow and threw our workmen out of work, I am sure that they would all be Socialists after a while. (Applause.) We know there are but two ways of making Socialists. The one we put into practice is through the brain. If we don't succeed, the capitalists put the other way into practice, through the stomach.

And here we have been talking like idiots, that we are going to shut out Oriental immigration, just as though we had the reins of government, just as though we controlled the whole country. Let us leave this question go and leave the capitalists do just as they see fit, and let us agitate among the workmen ourselves. Get them to understand what we mean by Socialism, and after that we will organize the Chinese and let them come. I think it is a benefit. The more we get here the better. It is the capitalists that would prevent them coming out of their own countries, the European countries. You go to any European country, and on their farms

who do you see? Nothing but old men, some of them eighty years old. You do not find any young men. All those young men, as soon as they are eighteen or twenty, leave their own country and come to America. If the Japanese would all do that we would all be Socialists in America and we would not have to work as hard as we do now under the capitalist system.

The previous question was ordered.

DEL. SPARGO: I have been asked by Comrade Miller to fix where this amendment fits into the resolution proper. I will explain because the Secretary will be unable to read it. The resolution before the house, you remember, contains this clause: "Distinguishing between the economic issue and the race issue, the question of racial differences involved in the agitation for the exclusion of Asiatic Immigrants, this convention does not feel itself competent to decide upon at this time in the absence of a scientific investigation of the matter." The amendment proposes to leave out that clause and to insert this more positive statement: "That we recognize that pending the success of the economic resolution on the political field, it may be wise and necessary to restrict immigration in order to protect labor from a competition from the Orient that proceeds from immigrants who do not enter the country for the purpose of establishing permanent homes." That is the amendment.

DEL. KNOPFAGEL (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I want to state that I too as Comrade Bertlyn, am not a German, nor a Russian, but one who has a long nose, and you know who it is. I belong to the despised race. I want to state here that from my very early childhood I was persecuted in Russia, not only as a Jew, but as one who tried to go against the Russian government. For this reason I am here, and upon this point I am opposed to this resolution. (Applause.) I want to ask you, comrades, suppose the Russians were Orientals, suppose they, the Russians, escaping from Siberia, came to America, would they be allowed to come here? A comrade here stated—he apparently is not a Russian and don't know anything about Russia—that the Russian Socialists should remain in Russia and can do more for Russia than those who are away from Russia. The comrades

should first go to Russia and learn the conditions there, and then they will find out that the Russian Socialist who is in America, cannot remain in Russia and propagate the principles of Socialism; he has to leave. Now, you are going to adopt a resolution in favor of the restriction of Oriental immigration. A delegate has been sneered at on this floor today because he spoke of the brotherhood of the working class. He expressed the sentiment of Karl Marx, "workmen of the world, unite." That was not a handy phrase with Karl Marx. It may be a handy phrase with trade union socialists. (Applause.) When Karl Marx said "workmen of the world, unite," he meant every word of it; he meant it in word and in spirit. Now, you are going to pass a resolution against Japan. We know that Japan is being organized, for the report of our international secretary is correct. I have no doubt; I have no reason to doubt it. They are organizing themselves into political organizations having the same purpose and the same goal in view that we have here in America. Japan is no better than Russia; they are already confiscating their papers; they are already persecuting their members; they are already placing them in jail. And now when that resolution is passed here, the capitalist class government and the capitalist class will find out and say that the socialists of America stand for restriction; that the man trying to escape from Japan, trying to escape from the gallows, has no place to come and find a refuge and save his life. (Applause.) It was stated that it would lower the standard of living in America. Let us see. It seems only yesterday that I came here to America. There were few millionaires then, but in the time since I came to America I see that the poor fellow that was here when I came here is a millionaire now. I have seen the standard of living lowered since I arrived in America, not because of immigration, but because of the introduction of machinery into production. (Applause.) I want to state to you, comrades, that we have a panic now. There is a division in opinion as to the cause of the panic. Some say that it is a financial affair. Some take the old orthodox theory of Karl Marx. Whichever it be, there is one thing sure, that the last panic, whether financial or not, is caused by over-pro-

duction and under-consumption. If you stop immigration you will confine your sale of goods to the American workmen only, because according to the explanations given by those understanding the class struggle—I don't understand it; I am not a workman; he is a workman, he is an intellectual and understands it better. If the Orientals are forced to remain in China and Japan, the American manufacturer cannot sell his goods for so much money and he will look for a market in Japan or China, and if they only get eight cents a day there where they are at work to produce for sale in those countries, will not your standard of living be lowered anyhow, because of the fact that you have to produce so cheap that the Chinaman and the Japanese who live there will be able to buy? If he don't buy you close up your stores and factories, and you are thrown out, and if then there is a panic, don't blame immigration, but blame yourselves. (Applause.)

DEL. EDWARDS (Okla.): I am against the amendment. Comrade Chairman and comrades, it seems to me we have been overlooking the true mark a little bit, in regard to the idea of passing laws or resolutions excluding Chinese or Oriental labor from this country. Let us examine the facts for a minute and see what effect a resolution of this kind for the exclusion of the Orientals would have. In the year 1907, the exports of cotton goods from America fell off 40 per cent. Why? Because we Americans have for years been producing a surplus of cotton goods, and we have been finding our principal markets for this surplus in the countries of China and Japan. But, in the year 1907, 40 per cent of this market was lost to the American people. Why? Because the finest machinery, the finest cotton mills that American skill and ingenuity can create have been erected on the soil of China and Japan, and those two nations today can manufacture their own cotton goods, and, more than that, they can manufacture anything under the shining sun that we Americans can manufacture, and they can deliver it to us on our continent at less than one-half our present prices, and what are the capitalists going to do? They are going to shift the scene of action. They are going to manufacture their cotton goods in

China and Japan with that cheap labor, and it will come in direct competition with the American workman, and what could all your resolutions do to oppose them, to keep those people out of this country? (Applause.) The seeming prosperity which the American people have enjoyed for the last five years was caused by the enormous sale of machinery and electrical supplies to the two nations of China and Japan. (Applause.) The finest flouring mills, the finest mills of every description, have been erected on the shores of those two nations, and they are almost in readiness for operation and are in a position to manufacture anything under the shining sun that we Americans can manufacture, and deliver it to us at less than half our present prices. And they have got enough people over there to do the manufacturing work of the world, and what good will it do us to pass resolutions excluding them, when the capitalists of the world are going to give them the jobs? (Applause.)

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I speak against the amendment. I speak in favor of the exclusion of the Chinese. I want to say this: Every country can take care of its own problems far better than when there is this immigration that is brought about by the capitalists in the interest of capitalism. I want to say that the Chinese can look after their own interests in their own country where they understand their own laws, better than they can come to our shores, and beginning to learn what our laws are here. I want to say that we can take care of our own matters for that reason here better than if we go to China and have to learn their language and their laws. Therefore I am in favor of the exclusion of the Chinese and in no uncertain terms. I have been up in the north country. I have been up in the copper country and I have seen the tricks of the capitalists up there where they took one nation and pitted it against the other, until there are five or six men down there pulling out the ore, and not one of them can talk in the language of the others. How long do you think it would take to teach them the laws of this country or to teach them economics or anything of that kind. Here men get up like Comrade Lewis and tells us that a Chinese cook gets more money than an American cook.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): That is true. DEL. TUTTLE: All right. Then let us make an exception for the Chinese cooks, but all the others let us keep out. That is one of the reasons that these men who are looked upon as intellectuals should be watched. That is one of them. The intellectuals are not frightened of the Chinese. So far as these refugees are concerned that are talked about by Knopfingel—so far as these refugees are concerned, I want you to understand that the time is very close at hand when the refugee will be in a worse prison in America than he was in Russia. Don't think that capitalism will do any differently here than it does in any other country in the world. We have only to look to Idaho—the bull-pens, and Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone. Don't think, my friends, that this is the land for the refugee. Don't worry. He will be hanged, drawn and quartered, imprisoned, tortured here by the capitalist class just as well, just as safely, and he will be just as beautifully skinned as in any other part of the world. When Marx said, "Workmen of the world unite," Marx said that in language that could be understood. He didn't say workmen of the world rotate. Those who don't speak English, go where English is spoken. Those that can only speak English, go to foreign-speaking countries. He didn't tell them to study useless languages and laws; he said: Crystallize the workmen of the world into an organization that will fight everywhere for the working classes. That means something to me; I know the meaning of it.

DEL. PAULISCH (N. Y.): I am in favor of the exclusion of the Chinese. I think we have heard all these fine phrases before in regard to the brotherhood of man, and in regard to class consciousness, and the open gate for the oppressed, but I don't believe we can stand here and invite the coolie labor of China into this country in the interest of the capitalist class. It has been stated that if we do not allow Chinamen to come into this country the capitalist class will erect factories in China and Japan and their manufactures will compete with those of the American workman. If may be true. But if you allow Chinese coolies to come in here in the sense in which the capitalist class wish to bring them in here at this

time, they will pit the Chinese and Japanese against the English-speaking races, and create race hatred and race riots, and I want to say that it is impossible to go to the American workingman, inflamed with this feeling of race hatred, and show him that it is to his interest to become a Socialist as against the appeals of those who will say it is to his interest to kill Chinamen that we have admitted into this country, and thus perpetrate this system and keep us from growing. I do not believe the time has arrived when we can do this. I am not opposed to allowing Chinese and Japanese to come in—that is, restrict them entirely. I am opposed to it, however, at this time, because I believe that this agitation going on at the present time, as we read about it and as it has taken effect in the American factory and mill, is a thing brought about by the capitalist class to embroil us in a battle of hatred between us and the Chinaman, as they do now between organized workmen and the colored men in some of the states. It is hard to reach the intelligence of a man who is inflamed with that kind of feeling towards the Chinese.

Another point: It has been said that it will not bring down the living conditions of the American workingmen. I want to say that we cannot compare any race that has landed on the shores of this country—even though they come from the poorest part of Russia—we cannot compare them with the coolie labor of China in any sense. I don't believe that the most ignorant man from Russia, or anywhere else—even from the Sicilian islands of Italy—can be compared to Japanese and Chinese coolie labor. There is a chance to meet those men. We all know the history of the difficulties that we have had to contend with in this line in our propaganda of the last few years, the capitalist forces pitting one class of American workmen against others; we have had all we could do to handle these things. And I believe that the admission of the Chinese coolies without any restriction whatever would present a far greater and more difficult problem than anything we have yet had to contend with.

DEL. SPARGO (closing for the Committee on Resolutions): I want the friends in the gallery and in the rear to remember that I am not addressing them, but the delegates in this conven-

tion, and that I do not desire any expressions of opinion from anybody but the delegates to this convention.

Upon the question of this amendment, comrades, I desire to ask you this: You are asked by the mover of this amendment to commit the Socialist Party of America to a definite attitude toward a given race as a race. You are asked to take an attitude of hostility against a race as a race. That is a long, long cry from any position the Socialist Party has yet taken in this country. It may be the correct attitude. I don't know. If upon investigation it should appear that the working class interests of this country demand it, then we ought to take that attitude. I am not of those who can satisfy themselves with high-sounding phrases. "Workers of the world, unite." That did not mean that the workers of the world were to unite in the United States or in any particular country. It meant that the workers in China, the workers in India, the workers in Germany, the workers in this country, should unite against the capitalist class in its own country and unite internationally. But, comrades and friends, I am prepared, if I can be convinced of the fact, that the racial differences are such that they are insurmountable, and that they must always draw race lines in this country—if I can be convinced of that fact, then I am prepared to take my stand against Asiatic immigration—but not till then.

I ask you to act as sober-minded men and women and to say: "Let us find out the facts first and then pledge the Socialist Party of America on the basis of those facts carefully ascertained, carefully discussed, carefully sifted, carefully brought before the whole membership—and not upon the basis of a passionate appeal, a prejudiced appeal on either side of this convention."

Comrades, I ask you to vote cautiously, because the interests of the American Socialist Party are at stake, and this is a fight where we want to know all the facts—

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. The secretary will read the amendment.

The amendment was read.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will adopt this amendment indicate it by say-

ing aye. Those opposed, no. The noes have it.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: A telegram has been handed me by the courtesy of the United Press Association representative on the other side of the table, which I ask consent to read. (Reading):

Telluride, Colo., May 14, 1908.

Steve Adams, accused member of the Western Federation of Miners, won decided victory here today when judge granted motion of attorneys for change of venue shifting the trial from Telluride to Grand Junction, where it was admitted he could get a fair trial.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have disposed of the amendment. We are now upon the main question of the report of the committee.

DEL. FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I am opposed to the resolution for the following reasons. It is proposed in that resolution to study a question that we now thoroughly understand, and that we disagree upon simply because some think it is inexpedient to make a decided declaration or to take a decided stand upon the question. It would be a very difficult matter to find a Socialist—a thorough-going, intelligent Socialist—that has any race prejudice. It would be a difficult proposition to find anywhere a Socialist movement, not only of a state or nation, but a Socialist movement anywhere that has a race prejudice as a whole. We are practically agreed upon this question of exclusion of immigrants, no matter how they come here, whether it be by contract labor or whether they come individually of their own free will. This question reminds me of what the capitalist class have used for many years as "dope" or "bait" to catch the votes of the working class by dividing them on the question of free trade or tariff. The Socialist movement of this country constantly pointed out the fact that free trade or high tariff did not interest the working class of this country. That is pre-eminent in this country. That is pre-eminent in the bourgeoisie proposition, and if it had been suggested that a committee be appointed for the purpose of studying that question we should have said plainly: We understand this question does not interest the working class or affect the larger capitalists in their fights with the smaller capitalists for economic control

of the markets. We are agreed upon that point, and that is why we never put a plank on that subject in the platform; that is why we never passed a resolution on that question, that is why we never appointed committees to study the question, because we understood that as working men and working women the question did not interest us, but it did interest the capitalist class.

Comrades, I don't believe that any of you are frightened, as Socialists, by the possibility of the yellow man coming to this country; you are not frightened by the proposition that some of the comrades have made here, particularly Comrade Berger, that if they do come here—five thousand yearly—it is only a question of ten years before you will be swept off the face of this continent—

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Five million, I said.

DEL. FIELDMAN: The world as a whole is bound to make progress. It does not make any difference to the working class as a whole how the capitalist class attacks the working class. The workers as a whole are rising and they are bound to rise. Nothing can possibly interfere with their controlling the forces of the world in the very near future. Whether the capitalist class succeeds or fails on the battlefield of high tariff or low tariff, whether they fight for exclusion or immigration unlimited, the working class, no matter where they are, are bound to rise. That capitalist system is crumbling, and I do not care whether it is the yellow workingman or the black workingman or the white workingman, or the Irish or the German or the American workingman who rule this country so long as it is the working classes that rule it. That is the main proposition. Therefore, comrades, I do not believe we ought to appoint a committee for the purpose of giving up this time to the study of this question. We are agreed that the workers of the world are equal; that there are no differences—or if there are, we ought to wipe them out and not encourage them. I hope you will not allow the deception to exist in your mind, nor will you allow the impression to be made upon the mind of the public, even for a moment, that the American workingman needs to make a study of the yellow workingman. The yellow workingman has proved himself capable of taking care of the capitalist

situation in Japan, and he will do the same in China. If he comes here we will unite with him, and they will unite with us in wiping capitalism out of existence.

DEL. COLE (Cal.): I speak for the resolution. If I did not have a special word to say that had not yet been said I would not rise. I speak for the resolution because I have that special word to say. I have two or three of them. The first special word is this: I want to notify you that the Pacific coast is not united in demanding anti-immigration laws. It is not united in the Socialist Party. It is not united in the labor field for a strong demand for anti-immigration laws. I write for a labor paper continually; I am supported by a labor paper continually; I read no anti-immigration sentiment; therefore I know that the trades union men themselves are not united in these demands for anti-immigration laws.

Now, I wish to say this—and this is a point that has not been made: I am heartily and strongly for the working class, I am of the working class, a descendant of the working class, and never expect to get out of the working class. Now, I look back over the history of the world, not of the United States alone, but of the whole world, for the last hundred years, and I see in all nations, in all lands, in all states, progress, steady progress, toward an organization of the different races, toward an amalgamation of the races.

Comrades, the Socialist Party does not leave humanity. The Socialist Party must take its lessons from humanity. You must look at human progress; keep your ear to the ground, and see which way the human race is traveling, in order to know how to act. For the last one hundred years the steady progress of the world has been toward an amalgamation of the races. You can no more stop that progress than you can sweep the Pacific ocean back with a broom. Are you going to waste your time in an effort to stop this progress? Or are you going to line up to the best of your ability in your efforts to defeat the capitalist class?

I wish to say one word about the manner of conducting the industries of China and Japan. Certain comrades have said that they have no coal or oil or iron in China. They have said that

they lack natural resources in the Orient. I tell you that is not the fact; they have those resources in the Orient; but they are simply not developed. But machinery is being taken there rapidly, as rapidly as it can be shipped from the Pacific coast, and those resources are going to be developed, and quickly, too, in the very near future. Comrades, some will say, very well, let them take their machinery industries and establish their factories in the Orient; we will keep our farms. But the capitalist class are monopolizing the land. If they take the machine industries to China and Japan you cannot turn to agriculture because the capitalists are monopolizing the land. You have got to work in the factory or on the land. Now, this is the situation, and it is a serious one. It is a grave situation that we have before us, and I claim, comrades, hard as that truth is to face, that the wages of labor are bound to go down in the near future, because you will have to compete with the Oriental races either here or abroad. Therefore, comrades, your main object should be to unite all the races in one great fight against capitalism and capture the political power of the world. There is your only hope. If the capitalists can divide the workers on the race question; if they can stir up race hatred on the Pacific coast against the Japanese and the Chinese, they will make use of that race hatred to bring about war with Japan, slaughter the American and Japanese workmen, break up the Pacific coast unions, and at the end of the war you will have unlimited, unrestricted immigration, for the trusts will then have complete control of the situation. War will destroy the unions on the coast. Trades unionism cannot go forward and develop in the face of war. The Standard Oil Company wants to bring about war with Japan at this moment, because a Japanese trust has gained control of oil in California, and proposes to take it to Japan and refine it and ship it all over the world. For that reason, because the Standard Oil Company fears competition in Japan, they want to stir up the Pacific coast working class. I thank you for your attention.

DEL. HAYES (Ohio): I want to speak in opposition to the resolution.

I am opposed to postponing action on this matter for practically four years. I don't know at the present juncture a

single body of organized labor throughout the length and breadth of this land, a single body of working people who are handed together for the purpose of bettering their conditions, who are in favor of unrestricted immigration of coolie labor into the United States. I would say to you that if these coolies—whom some of these theorists, some of the comrades who do not come in contact or competition with them, are in favor of admitting—if they were Socialists or even trades unionists, then let us admit them. On the other hand, they are simply an added load on the back of the workers, another burden for the struggling men and women who are trying to better their conditions or to prevent themselves being driven into a condition of degradation and slavery.

The Stuttgart convention may have passed a resolution on this matter, that possibly, to be charitable, very few of the delegates understood. How many coolie laborers go from Japan and China into Great Britain, or into France, or into Germany, or into Switzerland, or any other of the industrial European nations? Practically none. But they come here in swarms. Thousands upon thousands sneak across the borders to come in ruinous competition with white labor, intensifying the class struggle, and to the detriment of the workers who are fighting for better conditions and expect to continue fighting. Oh, yes, Karl Marx said, "Workingmen of the world, unite." That statement I believe emanated about sixty years ago. Marx himself has been dead for twenty-five years. I believe if Marx lived in the United States, and investigated conditions on the Pacific coast, that Karl Marx would be likely to change his tactics on the question and would not advocate a plan which is so plainly and unmistakably for the advantage of the capitalist class.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): A point of order. I know Comrade Hayes well. He is making a speech in favor of that resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

DEL. HAYES: I am opposed to the resolution. That resolution carries with it the postponement of this question for four years. I want immediate action here and now in favor of the exclusion of the coolies from Japan and China. I say to you that it would be danger-

ous for the Socialist Party to go into the field in this campaign and be charged, without an opportunity to make a denial, with standing for unrestricted immigration from the Orient. You will have every workman who has carried a card, or who has struck, or who has stood up for his principles, opposing you at every turn and in every way.

Comrades, I am compelled as a worker engaged in the industrial struggle in this country, who has given consideration to and heard from men in every part of the labor movement, who come face to face with this cold, stubborn fact of oriental immigration every day of their lives, to vote against the report of the committee, or at least for its reference back in order that that part as to four years' postponement, four years' procrastination, four years of cowardice, may be stricken out and another motion substituted for it.

I want to make one more point and then I am through. Reference has been made to what is termed the international solidarity of the working class. Now, if the Chinese or the Japanese—despite the fact that there is a small nucleus of the Socialist movement in Japan or China—if they would demonstrate to the world that there is the slightest revolutionary spirit in them, if they would demonstrate it by battling against the forces that oppress them, I would be inclined to be more lenient upon this question, but it will take generations and possibly centuries before the orientals become fully aroused to their condition—

(Cries of "No, No, No.")

DEL. HAYES: You may ridicule it if you like, but you will find I am right. There is just one more point I want to make, and that is that the Socialist Party will have obtained control of the United States of America and introduced here the co-operative commonwealth before the orientals have even started in the line of modern industrialism, and when that has come to pass we can welcome them to our shores without any danger to ourselves or the progress we have made.

DEL. SPARGO (closing for the Committee on Resolutions): I want to ask you first, as Socialists, do you agree that the fundamental principle of modern Socialism is the class struggle, or do you agree that it is a Utopian idea of brotherhood which we have had for

thousands of years? If you believe in the class struggle, you cannot vote against that resolution; and I want to ask if you believe that the economic interest of the working class is to be the controlling principle with this political party of Socialism, or do you believe that some abstract ethical principle is to be the controlling force, and if you say it is to be the economic interest of the working class which is to guide the working class, then I say you cannot vote against the declaration of that principle in this resolution.

Now, then, comrades, we have decided already that we are not yet fully informed upon the racial questions involved in this matter and therefore are not prepared to vote intelligently upon it. What does my friend Hayes say—for I wish to leave all the rest unanswered, because it answers itself in the very weakness of its own statement—but what does my friend Hayes say? He asks you to believe that there is to be a panic in the country, that the working class movement is to be demoralized because we will not take immediate action at the behest of those labor unions which demand complete exclusion. But I say to him, "Friend Hayes, why hasn't it happened before?" We have never had any declaration of that sort before, and the unions have them there for twenty-five years or more, ever since Dennis Kearney occupied the "sand lots" in San Francisco. Comrades, I ask you to vote that we are a party of the working class, that it is the economic interest of the working class which must guide our party, that we leave it to the states themselves to decide if they have an Asiatic problem. They can decide it upon the basis of local state autonomy, and, above all, I ask that you recognize that the immigration problem is a big problem, a complex problem, and that therefore you proceed to the election of a Committee of Five.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the adoption of the report of the committee. Those in favor of the adoption of the report will make it known by saying aye; those opposed, no. The ayes have it.

DEL. HOLMAN: I wish to go on record in the minutes of this convention as voting no.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): Wash-

ington desires to go on record as voting no.

A DELEGATE: New Jersey demands the same right.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can make those requests to the secretary.

Nominations made for the Permanent Immigration Committee, and the election deferred until the following day in order to have the ballots printed.

On motion of Del. Hagel of Oklahoma it was decided to hold an evening session.

FREE SPEECH.

DEL. SPARGO (continuing report of Committee on Resolutions): There are two resolutions yet to be reported to this body. The first is on free speech. It is as follows:

"Capitalism, fleeing before the triumphant advance of Socialism, is trying to suppress free speech. Ignorance and intimidation are the twin forces that the ruling capitalist class relies on to hold its power in order to control and rob the working class. The police power of the state is being used forcibly to prevent the peaceable assembly of the working class to discuss their grievances and for the adoption of measures to secure its emancipation from wage slavery. Public meetings of the Socialist Party all over the country have been unlawfully and brutally broken up and the speakers arrested, fined and imprisoned without warrant of law, by officials who ignorantly believe that a policeman's uniform clothes them with autocratic power.

"We, the Socialist Party of the United States, in National Convention assembled, serve notice upon the capitalist class that we shall hold its henchmen acting as public officials responsible for their illegal acts, and we shall prosecute them in the criminal courts to the full extent of the law; also that we shall sue them in the civil courts for actual damages to compensate our comrades for the wrongs inflicted upon them."

I move the adoption of that resolution. The motion was seconded by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the resolution will say aye. Those opposed, no. The resolution is carried unanimously.

THE UNITY QUESTION.

DEL. SPARGO: The next resolution is by no means a unanimous recommendation, I am sorry to say. We have a majority report and two minority reports. One report is signed by six members of the committee; the first minority report is signed by two members and the second minority report is signed by one member. The subject of the various reports is the unity of the two Socialist parties in America. With your permission I shall read the three reports and ask them that the signers of the first minority report may be represented by Comrade Kaplan, who will act as chairman of that minority, and the other minority report may be represented by Comrade Wagenknecht, who is the only man signing it, and who will take responsibility for his own report. As chairman of the majority I assume responsibility only for our own report, and upon that report we take our stand. The majority recommendation is as follows:

"Resolved, That no steps looking toward the unity of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party be taken at this time, other than to invite all members of the Socialist Labor Party who so desire to become members of the Socialist Party."

(Signed) BENJAMIN F. WILSON.

ED. MOORE.

H. R. KEARNS.

C. C. ROSS.

ELIZABETH H. THOMAS.

JOHN SPARGO.

The first and second minority reports I will read merely that you may have all the reports in their proper sequence, but the defense of these latter two reports rest upon the shoulders of Comrade Wagenknecht in one case and Comrade Kaplan in the other.

FIRST MINORITY REPORT ON UNITY QUESTION.

"Whereas, The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party has requested the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party to arrange for a conference upon the question of the unity of the two parties; and Whereas, We believe that we are representing the sentiments of our constituents in the matter in expressing our gratification at this attitude on the part

of our S. L. P. comrades, we instruct the National Secretary of the Socialist Party to send a reply to the Socialist Labor Party invitation to the following effect:

"First: We are in favor of the unity of the two parties, provided that we are not called upon to surrender any fundamental principles of the party as expressed in the official decision of this convention.

"Second: We are just entering upon the most momentous and critical campaign in our history, and our supreme interest at the present time and for some months to come is the political fight against capitalism, and we cannot undertake to devote our time and energies to the discussion of possible terms of unity in our locals and in our press. We cannot afford to have our best and most active workers occupied with this question during the coming months. We are therefore both unwilling and unable to enter now into such a conference.

"Third: In view of these facts, we think it wise not to enter upon any negotiations between the two national organizations at this time, but we hold that the details and the time of arriving at unity, if thought desirable in any state, shall be left to the Socialists of that state.

"Fourth: It is the sense of this convention that in the event that the Socialist Labor Party refrains from putting a presidential ticket in the field, the situation should not be so interpreted as to forbid the Socialist Party in any state from uniting with the Socialist Labor Party on state and local ticket."

(Signed) M. KAPLAN.

C. H. KERR.

Minority report No. 2 reads as follows. It is signed by Comrade Wagenknecht of Washington:

SECOND MINORITY REPORT ON UNITY QUESTION.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: It is the same with the exception of clauses three and four.

DEL. SPARGO: I shall be very pleased to omit reading the first part. Comrade Wagenknecht proposes to change the last two clauses of the first minority report to read as follows:

"It is therefore our decision that nominations for a Committee of Seven

members to represent the Socialist Party as proposed by the Socialist Labor Party be made during the month of January, 1909, and that a conference be held as soon thereafter as can be arranged."

Comrade Wagenknecht then proposes to leave out entirely the clause which provides for a possible unity in the states rather than a national combination.

DEBATE ON UNITY QUESTION.

DEL SPARGO: Comrades, on behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of the majority report, that no steps looking toward the unity of our party with the Socialist Labor Party be taken at this time, other than to invite all the members of the Socialist Labor Party who so desire to become members of the Socialist Party.

SEVERAL DELGATES: Second the motion.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): On behalf of the minority I offer as a substitute the minority report signed by Comrade Kerr and myself.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. KAPLAN: I may say that I did not expect that this resolution submitted by the minority, judging by the sentiment manifested by the delegates on the floor, will carry. But you also know, comrades, that although I am a Duluth man today, for the past four or five years that I was living here, I have been on the minority side before. I am on the minority side today because I believe that there is an important principle involved in this proposition. Here we are confronted with a situation where another Socialist Party, through its National Executive Committee, passes a resolution showing a desire for unity of all the Socialist forces, for a unity of their and our political parties. It is true that the S. L. P. is a smaller organization. It is true that we are continually increasing the membership. But my contention is this, that unless it can be demonstrated—I don't believe that it can—that the S. L. P. is not a Socialist party—unless that can be demonstrated, and I say it cannot be demonstrated, that the S. L. P. does not stand for the principles of Socialism fundamentally, then I contend that we ought not to put on one side in a slurring way this request of theirs. My contention is this, and I am speaking as an ex-member of the So-

cialist Labor Party—I was a member of the national convention that took place at Rochester, the first convention of the S. L. P.—speaking as a man who was one of the participants in the events that transpired away back in 1899, my contention is that the differences between us are matters of tactics, that they are personal differences; my contention is that the comrades of the Socialist Labor Party—and don't forget that when I mention them that I apply the same to ourselves—that the tactics that they have pursued of going out and knocking every fellow, the tactics of going out and calling other men names, were the tactics that put them in the position they occupy at the present time. But, comrades, men are fallible. No one of us is infallible. I contend that the very fact that these comrades have initiated through their national committee this request for a conference is evidence, in my opinion, at least, that they have realized their mistake, that they have realized that their tactics are not the kind of tactics that can develop a healthy Socialist movement, and I also contend—if you pass the report of the majority, and I have not gone into details, yet, because I want to leave that for the close—I contend if you pass this resolution of the majority you will revive the S. L. P., and I will tell you why. You have never yet found, or at least I don't know of any state, I don't know of any political or any other movement, that was killed by mere hatred. If the Socialist Labor Party is sound fundamentally in its principles, you cannot kill them by turning around and saying, "You have called us a liar; you are another." I contend that the only way you can kill the Socialist Labor Party is by kindness; the only way you can unite the political Socialist movement of the country—I have not come to the Stuttgart resolution yet, or rather the Amsterdam resolution yet—is by going out and showing the world, showing the United States, that while we are calling upon the workers of the world to unite, we are not ourselves in a condition of disorganization, not merely between one political party and another, but also among ourselves, for the same spirit has developed among us—

THE CHAIRMAN: Your time is up, **DEL. KAPLAN:** In conclusion, I contend that the same spirit with which

we have been attacking one another on the outside has now developed among ourselves on the inside. When I went to the city of Duluth I round the S. L. P. there. I spoke on the street corner, and after making my remarks there was just one question, and that question was, "What is the difference between the S. L. P. and the S. P.?" That didn't insult me. That very man is working today and hand in hand with us. Not in our movement, but he speaks upon our platform and he speaks upon their platform. We work together, and when the crucial moment arrived when it was necessary for the workers of the country to work together for the purpose of helping the Western Federation of Miners, the Moyer-Haywood Conference was participated in by both the Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.) (reading second minority report): I wish to move that this report be accepted by the convention.

DEL. STRICKTON (Mich.): I second Comrade Wagenknecht's motion.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: The difference between the second minority report and the first minority report is great; the difference between the two minority reports and the majority report is greater. The majority report is against unity. The two minority reports are for unity. My only effort now shall be to distinguish the differences between the two minority reports.

We all know that the question of unity is being agitated in the Socialist Party, not only by our own press, but also by the Socialist Labor Party from the outside. Now, one thing we should consider is this: Shall we have our present campaign infringed upon, or

made a side issue, by having a discussion of this question of unity during the campaign? I say no. I say this question of unity should not be discussed during the campaign, either as a national issue or state issue, either between the two national committees or as a state issue between the state organization of both parties, or as a local issue between the local organizations of both parties. I say the question of unity should be left until after the national campaign, after the campaign in the states and locally, and for that reason I submit this minority report.

Comrade Kaplan's report is based upon the fact that in two states of this great Union the S. L. P. is working in harmony with the S. P. Now, I say we cannot afford to make rules for exceptions. No well-balanced body will ever take an exception and base a rule upon the exception. I claim that Comrade Kaplan has tried to give us a rule for the whole which is only applicable to exceptions. We cannot help it that the S. L. P. works in harmony with the Socialist Party in two states, Michigan and Minnesota. We know they do not work in harmony in the rest of the states. The fact that they do not work in harmony in the rest of the states means that if this question is brought into the states, namely, the question of unity, then these states' contentions will be distributed throughout the national campaign, and instead of having a good Socialist Party campaign we will have a campaign which is more or less weakened by the discussion of this matter. Therefore I offer my report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The time has come for adjournment.
Adjourned until 7:30 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

Chairman Clark called the convention to order at 7:30.

THE CHAIRMAN: In your efforts to get a hearing this evening I want you to confine yourselves to the table of the delegation that you are with, and keep away from those other tables. That is the way I am going to take you when you want to get the floor.

DEBATE ON UNITY QUESTION CONTINUED.

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I understand that the business before us is the matter that we were discussing before the adjournment. I move the previous question.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I second it, understanding that there are twelve speeches to be made. (Carried.)

DEL. HANFORD (N. Y.): I wish to oppose the minority report of Comrade Wagenknecht and to favor the majority report of the committee. Comrades, I regret that in five minutes I cannot go into this subject in a way to do it justice. I do not speak here at this time for the sake of changing any votes. I have no doubt you have your opinions made up, but I believe it will be in order if a few important facts regarding the so-called Socialist Labor Party are placed in the records of this convention. This is all the more important because many of the more recent members of our party are not familiar with the history of the S. L. P.

I want to say, first, that the reason I am opposed to the minority report of the comrade from Washington is that I do not recognize that the so-called Socialist Labor Party is a Socialist Party. (Applause, and a voice, "Good.") I do not recognize that it is a labor party, and I do not recognize that it is a political party. (Applause.) The so-called Socialist Labor Party is a scab labor party. The so-called Socialist Labor Party is a labor union faking party. Now, I want to get in the record one thing: I just want to prove that it is a scab labor party by its own evidence.

Back in 1900 there was a strike of the cigarmakers employed in the Davis factory in New York City. The New York Labor News Company, controlled by the Socialist Labor Party, in December, 1900, published a pamphlet entitled "The Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance vs. the 'Pure and Simple' Trade Union." That pamphlet was the stenographic report of a debate between Daniel DeLeon and Job Harriman. It was prepared by Benj. F. Keirhard, then a member of the Socialist Labor Party. In that debate it was shown by Job Harriman, and it was not disputed by DeLeon, that the strike of the cigarmakers in the Davis shop was AGAINST A REDUCTION IN WAGES. In his own report of that debate on page 42 of the pamphlet to which I have referred, DeLeon himself declared that when the officers of the International Cigarmakers' Union called the men working in the Davis shop on strike, "many of them went out." These are DeLeon's own words. Then this man who is leader of the S. L. P.—I might almost say he is the S. L. P.—justified the action of the Socialist

Labor Party's fake trade union, the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, in filling the places of the men who went out on strike in the Davis shop by declaring that the shop was only partly manned by union men, that therefore it was not a union shop, and that therefore it was all right for S. T. & L. A. members to take the places of the strikers. In an issue of The People in May, 1906, in the department under the heading of "Letter Box," the editor of The People, after stating that the members of the International Cigarmakers' Union were on strike in the Davis shop says: "The rest of the shop was then organized by the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance and the vacancies filled."

When you remember that DeLeon has for long years been the leader of the S. L. P., and when you remember that the pamphlet from which I have quoted is an S. L. P. publication, and that The People from which I have quoted is the official organ of the S. L. P., and that DeLeon is its editor, you will understand what I meant when I said that I wished to prove by its own evidence that the Socialist Labor Party is a Scab Labor Party.

In the words of the editor of the Daily People, it was all right when men went on strike in a certain International Cigarmakers' Union, it was all right then, because the "fakers" ordered a strike, for the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance to organize the shop and fill the vacancies. I want to say that any man who calls himself a Socialist and proposes to take the place of any man that is on strike on a question of wages, I care not whether he be a union man, an anti-union man, a non-union man, or a scab—I say the man that would scab on a scab does not deserve the name Socialist. (Great applause.) I say further, that we want no communication with these men. I say that I honestly believe that the only purpose of the resolution passed by the Executive Committee of the S. L. P. was to get a wedge into the Socialist party for the sake of splitting this party. (Applause.) The tactics of the Socialist Labor Party have not changed, and such being the case, if leaders were honest they could not and would not ask for unity with the Socialist Party. I am fully justified in believing that they do not look for

unity with us in good faith or for any good purpose.

Read the record of the S. L. P., and what do you find? You find, first, that it split the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance in 1898. You find, second, that it split the Socialist Labor Party in 1899. You find, third, that less than two years ago it split the I. W. W. (Applause.) Is there anything, is there any organization of labor that the S. L. P. methods and the S. L. P. commanders have ever been into that they have not split? And shall we let them into our organization that the Socialist Party may be split also? (A voice, "No.") We cannot afford to have anything to do with them at any time.

If any member of the S. L. P., finding out that party is a party of disorganization, disruption and death to the labor movement, wants to join our party, well and good. But I want nothing to do with Bill Sykes, the burglar; I want nothing to do and I want no communication with Jesse James, the train robber; I want nothing to do with Daniel DeLeon, the union wrecker, and Farley, the strike breaker, and men that are known as the enemies of the labor movement by every man in the United States who is devoted to that movement at all.

For years the S. L. P. workers did just one thing; they followed around all our speakers everywhere—to do what? To do what? To enlighten the people on the subject of socialism? No, indeed, but to discredit our speakers; not that they wanted to talk socialism, but they wanted our speakers to be unable to talk socialism. They did their best to destroy our party. Now, shall we take the serpent to our bosom and warm him so that he can disrupt this party as he has tried to do with everything else? I say no, and no. (Applause.)

DEL. SNYDER (Kan.): I only want to talk just a minute, to say that I read a letter, about a week before I left California, written to Eugene V. Debs, that Frank Bohn, National Secretary of the S. L. P., had quit the party and has offered to become a member of the Socialist party of the United States if they would take him in (applause), and that he recommended in that letter that the Socialist party pay no attention to the request for unity with Daniel DeLeon. (Applause.)

DEL. BAUER (Cal.): It is a very

poor specimen of a human being who won't stand up for what he believes to be true and right, although the majority may be against him. Now, I am going to let the older heads blow off their steam and indulge in personalities, if they please to do so, but I prefer to consume the five minutes allotted to me in dealing with the fundamental question involved. The question, in my opinion, is this, gentlemen and comrades: Are we going to assume the attitude of the Employers' Association toward the labor unions, and say to this that we call a skeleton organization, that pretends to represent the Socialist movement in this country, "We have nothing to arbitrate," or are we going to understand things? That is all. Now, I care but little for your opinion of me. I have worked loyally for seven years in the Socialist party, but I am proud to say that I have also been a member of the Socialist Labor Party for seven years previous to that time (applause), young though I may be, and I can but say that I have the utmost gratitude in my heart for the education that the Socialist Labor Party has given me. (Applause.)

Now, let me tell you, cut out all your personalities. I don't care a pin in hell what Daniel DeLeon may be or what Victor Berger may be, or what Comrade Hanford may be. But, I want to say this, comrades, that in a struggle between organizations just as in a struggle between individuals, there is a struggle for life, and the new organization, the Socialist party, has defeated the old mother organization in the struggle for existence. During that struggle, bitterness, strife and acrimonious discussions were bound to arise. If Jesus Christ himself, the lowly Nazarene, had represented one side, the condition for strife was there and strife it would have been. Now, then, we have grown, we have developed, we are strong. It is true, here is the skeleton, the remnant of that old guard left. Cut out DeLeon, but I say we have got our DeLeons in our own party. (Applause.) I speak from personal experience when I say that there are locals in the state of California, when I say that there are loyal socialists throughout this United States who have stayed out of the Socialist Party and out of the Socialist Labor Party. Why? They were disgusted with the Socialists of both sides. Now,

the reason why a few men stood by the old organizations, although they did not always agree with DeLeon, or the fact that the S. L. P. endorsed the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, is due to the fact that so few men have in them the quality that most of us lack, the quality of constancy. That is a quality that we should rather admire than shrink from. I admire the man who is not so fickle that he can change his political affiliations at every chance. Some other Socialist party may develop and offer promises greater than before, and these men who have so readily left the old S. L. P. will just as readily leave your party. Now, I do not say that we are to let the S. L. P., the skeleton, our parent organization, lay down the terms upon which we will unite with it. No, I do not care how you arrange this conference, but I do assert this, that if you assume the intolerant position that you charge the S. L. P. with, you, gentlemen and comrades and ladies, you have to lose and the S. L. P. will gain. That is what I claim. (Manifestations of disapproval.) When my time is up I will yield the floor to you.

You say, "Workmen of all countries, unite," but you are not big-hearted enough, great hearted enough to divest yourselves of the selfishness that you charge to the other side. (Applause.) You are the strongest. You can lay down your own terms. But, is it generous, is it great in the victor to say, "Now I have whipped you, I am going to walk on you for a few hours, or a few days, or a few months?" There is nothing generous, nothing noble about that. For the ten, fifty, or a hundred honest men that may be left of that grand old skeleton, for the sake of those I assume it is our duty, in the interest of workmen's organizations and socialist harmony, to submit to a conference. (Applause.)

DEL. LOCKWOOD (Mich.): I wish to say for the benefit of Comrade Ben Hanford and others that I have been in the movement sixteen years, and I do not want to be classed with those that came in recently. I know what I am talking about. I wish to say that on July 4, three years ago this coming July, the state of Michigan in its convention passed a resolution in favor of unity, and I am proud of the state for doing it. (Applause.) I want to say further,

that on July 4th, the following year, that resolution was again passed, having been submitted to a referendum and passed unanimously by the state in the meantime, and was again referred to a referendum and passed. I want to say further that the state of Michigan today, with but two exceptions, one local in Detroit, the smallest local in the city, and Local Cliff—and I make these exceptions for the benefit of the locals—I want to say that the entire state of Michigan, as far as I am able to learn, and I have been State Secretary for two years, is for unity. (Applause.) Why? Because of the fact that the Socialist movement demands that all forces that make for revolution get together, and to recognize, no matter what you say to the contrary, these old comrades in the S. L. P., and I am willing to admit that they have their faults; I am one who has suffered from their abuse and all that; but nevertheless I call your attention to this fact, that you can look around this convention and you will find the leading men among the best of you have come from where? From the old S. L. P. (Applause.) I want to say in spite of the fact that there may be leaders in that organization who have done wrong, that the rank and file of the S. L. P. are clear-cut revolutionary socialists (applause), and we need them in our movement. Now, I do not know that this proposition has been submitted properly and the committees have been given a chance to act. I do not know, when the report is in, that I will vote favorably, but I say I have a right, and that our party in Michigan has a right, to know on what ground the Socialist Labor Party proposes to unite with us, and to know whether there is not some chance of getting together and not turning them down before a trial. (Applause.) I have been, fortunately or unfortunately, in my experience in the Socialist movement, up against the capitalist courts, and you know that when a Socialist goes up against the capitalist courts, if he gets a trial it is a poor one. He is judged before he comes up, and the Socialist party, our party, has judged and tried them without a hearing.

(Applause and cries of "No.") I am in the minority. Granting that I am, I have been in the minority for sixteen long years in the Socialist revo-

lution, and may be in the minority in this body if necessary, standing for the principle of unity, uniting our forces for socialism. I claim that these old revolutionary socialists in the S. L. P. organization, made up of the material out of which revolutionists are made, have been, of course, the result of their environment and their struggle, in spite of all their mistakes. I do not want to play the part of a bully because our movement has grown larger than theirs. I think it is time for us to be a little generous. I think it is our business to recognize the principles that we advocate, the principles of brotherhood. Where are our principles of the brotherhood of man here, when we refuse even to confer with a body of Socialists? Where do we stand by our principles that we say we should get together? The Stuttgart resolution, as I understand, demanded that the Socialist parties of the different countries unite their forces against the common enemy. What are we doing toward uniting? I stand, and I think my state is behind me, for at least a conference, and I believe after the conference has been held, then we perhaps may change our mind, but as I see it today I shall stand for unity even after that, although without any compromise of principle. This is not a question of compromise of principle. It is a question, in my judgment, of the bitterness engendered by the different fights in which these comrades have been, the personal feelings taking possession of them to the exclusion of the good of the movement; and I am sorry, indeed, that we cannot enter the next campaign with a united force against the common enemy. Instead of that, we have still a division. I shall stand by our party.

DEL. SCHWARTZ (Pa.): Is it not a fact that when the Socialist party of Michigan offered to unite with the S. L. P., the S. L. P. turned them down? DEL. LOCKWOOD: No, not to my knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade who introduced the minority report will have five minutes to conclude the argument.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): I have not belonged to the party sixteen years. I have only been a member of the Socialist party for five years. It took me about three years to decide whether to join the Socialist Labor

Party or the Socialist party. (Applause.) Now it is taking other comrades in the United States just a little time to decide whether they shall join the Socialist Labor Party or the Socialist party.

There is just one reason why this minority report should be the report of the committee rather than the other minority report, and I wish to state that reason. The minority report before the house keeps the unity wrangle out of the states, out of the party, until after the national campaign. The other minority report will place the unity wrangle inside of the state organizations before the national campaign, and that is the difference. All those of you who believe that this matter should not come up until after the national campaign, I ask you to vote for the report now before the house. Now, Comrade Bohn and Comrade DeLeon are not together. Comrade DeLeon fired Comrade Bohn. (Applause and laughter.)

A DELEGATE: He will fire you yet.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: Then why should not Comrade Bohn say to Comrade Debs, "Don't advocate unity with the S. L. P.?" Why, of course not, not from Comrade Bohn's point of view. Some comrades have said that all that Comrade DeLeon or the S. L. P. is trying to do is to get a wedge into the Socialist party to disrupt the Socialist party. Well, the Socialist party is just a little too large to be disrupted by the Socialist Labor Party.

A DELEGATE: How about Mills? MR. WAGENKNECHT: Mills didn't disrupt the Socialist party of Washington. He tried to, but he found out that all he did was to disrupt himself. If the Socialist Labor Party has set a trap to trap the Socialist party, let me say one thing, that the Socialist Labor Party trap is just a little too small to trap the Socialist party.

Why are you against a unity conference in January, 1909? By advocating a unity conference, it does not mean that we unite. Certainly, if our different committees come together and our committees find out that the Socialist Labor Party is not in existence, how can unity be effected? If our committee and the committee of the Socialist Labor Party meet, and our committee says to the Socialist Labor Party, "Let us see your

membership roll," if they can produce nothing, what are we going to unite? Again, if our committee finds out that the Socialist Labor Party is a party based upon utopian principles, as Comrade Spargo says, and Comrade Hanford has said—

DEL. HANFORD: No, no.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT: He says the Socialist Labor Party is a scab party. If we find it is a scab party, why unite? Because you say you are going to have a conference does not mean that you are going to unite. There are just two reasons, practical ones, why we should have a unity conference. One is to take out of our own party the wrangle which will ensue if we do not propose a conference, and to take out of the hands of the S. L. P. the argument that we, the Socialist party of America, keep the Socialist party of America divided. (Applause.) Any man who has been present on the floor of this convention since its inception knows that there is just a little brains in the Socialist party, and that Daniel DeLeon has not a monopoly upon the Socialist brains of the United States. Anybody on the floor of this convention who is afraid of Daniel DeLeon—well, I am kind of ashamed of that Socialist. I have never seen a Socialist yet that I was afraid of, and no man's cause will prosper in the Socialist party if that man is afraid of any man in the Socialist party—Daniel DeLeon, Mills, and some others included. I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved to adopt the second minority report. Will you have it read to you again?

DELEGATES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you adopt the second minority report, say aye. Contrary, no. The noes have it.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND then read the first minority report.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): I do not think there is anyone in this room that will accuse me of any particular friendship for the Socialist Labor Party or organization. I recognize very much of the truth and strength of all that Comrade Hanford has said, and could add to that another tale perhaps even longer. With their national organization I believe we ought to have nothing to do. I told Comrade Kaplan this morning that if we were forced or driven into

any sort of unity with their national organization, that there was not room enough for me in the same party with the bunch that control it.

A DELEGATE: Oregon, too.

DEL. SIMONS: But I say this, that in Illinois we do not want them. I do not know what you want in other states.

A DELEGATE: We don't want them.

DEL. SIMONS: All right. But there are some states in this union where the position seems to be different. I care not how hard this S. L. P. fought the national organization in the past, but I say that I do not want to see any portion of the Socialist party of America slapped in the face. The comrade from the state of Michigan and the comrade from Minnesota seem to think that they want to unite with the S. L. P. in those states. I believe that it is no more than fair that we give them a chance to decide that question there, if they wish and how they wish, and that is the only thing that I say supports this. (Applause.) But if those states—and they seem to know—if the rank and file of the Socialist Labor Party in those states is made up of men and women that the Socialist party members in those states want in their organization, the Socialist party members in those states are the best ones to judge. If they decide that they want them, I say to you that we have no right to put an obstacle in the road of their successful campaign. (Applause.) We do not have to have them where we do not want them, and we do have to have them where we do. It is in our hands. We hold the majority in every state. We can do exactly as we please on that question. I do not believe it will disrupt a state. There will be no unity conference in Illinois to tear us up here. I do not hear any of it in Wisconsin. But if there are other states, as in the state of Washington, as this comrade says, where they can work with the Socialist Labor Party members there, then I say, give them a chance. That is the thing I believe in. We believe in state autonomy. It is in our constitution from beginning to end. We are but simply applying that principle here. I do not think it is of such tremendous importance. We are taking into the local in the city of Chicago more mem-

bers every six months than the Socialist Labor Party has in the entire United States. We do not need to worry very much about the thing, but it is simply to avoid trouble to them. It seems to be a thing that we have to settle, and settle along this way. And so, for the sake of the comrades in the Socialist party in those states, I shall cast my vote for this minority report and ask you to vote in the same way, if you think it advisable.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): A question of personal privilege. A false impression has been conveyed that Minnesota wants the S. L. P. Now, I want to say as a delegate from Minnesota—

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a question of personal privilege.

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): You might just as well try to unite DeLeonism with our movement as to try and mix oil and water. Oil and water can be mixed in only one way, and that is to mix it with lye, and we don't want any of that thing.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Too much lye will make too many liars.

DEL. FURMAN: Now, I speak as one in a position to speak from my own membership in the S. L. P., for I joined it in February, 1893. I sat on the National Executive Committee of the S. L. P. for four straight years, and for two years on the State Committee of the S. L. P. and all through that time the solid members of the State Committee and the S. L. P. National Executive Committee, except the trinity of DeLeon, Kuhn and Vogt, tried to get rid of DeLeon, and we could not. We could not get rid of him any more than you can get rid of the bite of a rattlesnake. The poison is there. If I see something sticking out from under a plank, with the fangs of a rattlesnake sticking out from one side and the tail of a rattlesnake sticking out from the other side, I know pretty sure there is a rattlesnake under there.

There is another thing that I want to refer to. It has been said that it will be all right to consider this thing next January. I will tell you why next January has been set. Behind this pretense of wanting unity through the membership of the rank and file of the S. L. P., there is an intrigue away back; it goes away back to the national party of the S. L. P. Their henchmen come around

on the outside and engineer in a manner similar to Pinkerton style, and these fellows work on the outside so you think it is the rank and file, but it comes from that thing under the plank. (Applause.)

Now, then, why set the first of January, 1909? Their paper is printed by an organization that is under the control of the New York police. They have a contract that expires on the first of January, 1909. They got into possession of that publishing association through debts, and when the time comes it is either death or unity. I have been all through it. I have seen disruption and disorganization. If you follow the slimy control of DeLeon and the trinity of the S. L. P. you will find split, disruption, disorganization, disgruntled members. It is not unity at all; it is disorganization.

I see down in the New York City delegation every man on the list—I don't know as there are more than one or two there but what are old S. L. P. men. Here is a comparison. Every man on it, nearly, is a stumpspeaker, a soapbox orator. Every man, if unity is consummated with the S. L. P., of that delegation—and it is a fair representation of all the working element in New York City—will go out the very moment they get official notice that the S. L. P. organization has joined the S. P.

DEL. HILLOUT: No, no.

Other DELEGATES: No.

DEL. FURMAN: I am not making boasts or anything of the kind, but I know the spirit of the men that went out of the S. L. P. at the time of the split, and you cannot hold them in there. Go around and talk with them. I come from Brooklyn, the home of the strongest part of the organization anywhere in the country, and of the S. L. P. in New York state. The speakers, the agitators and the old German comrades in New York state—you couldn't hold them in there with chains big enough to hold a steer. They would not stay. It is not unity. Now, it has been a question at the international congress. You cannot find, any place where the international congress advocates DeLeonism. It is only a pretense, you know, I would like to speak on the tactics of the thing if I had time.

DEL. STRICKLAND (Ind.): A point of information. If you let me

get this information it will enlighten the convention. A matter came up at the Indiana state convention, and I am the Rev. F. G. Strickland who has been "exposed" by the Weekly People once more, and in that convention we asked them, since they requested of us to take state action on unity, what they would do if we did pass it, and they said they could not take any corresponding action for they were organized without state autonomy, but as one solidified organization, and could not unite with us as a state. If that be true, why does Comrade Simons and why do the other comrades advocate it? I want the information from Kaplan or Simons.

DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): I want to say, comrades, I have not spoken today, and I think I have contained myself pretty well, and expect to keep within the five minutes anyhow. I am also from New York. I have also been in the S. L. P. about twelve years before the formation of the present party. I will not walk out of the Socialist party if you decide in favor of unity. (Applause.) I have no doubt whatsoever my good Comrade Furman just made a slip of the tongue; he did not mean it. He will not walk out of the party if we unite, and no member of the New York delegation will, no matter what the majority decide. (Applause.)

I am in favor of the first minority report because I think it more expedient at this time in view of the approaching campaign than the second minority report; but I am in favor of it not only for the grounds mentioned by Comrade Simons, but also because I hold that through local co-operation, eventual unity, or rather merger, of the Socialist Labor Party in the Socialist party, will take place; and I am in favor of such a merger. (Applause.)

Now, comrades, let me tell you that if there is any man on the floor of this convention who has personal justification for bitterness against the S. L. P., it is no one more than your humble servant.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. HILLQUIT: And if there is any man in the Socialist party who has been so absolutely unjustly and maliciously abused by DeLeon, then I would like to see him.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. HILLQUIT: But I say at the same time that is not the question be-

fore us. We are not trying to square up the old accounts. (Applause.) I say also to you, I make myself no illusion about the matter; I know the Socialist Labor Party hardly represents anything to add strength and influence. I know they come to us as a last resort because they face annihilation as a party. I am not deceived, comrades, and with all that, I say, as a matter of correct Socialist tactics and expediency, considering everything, it is well ultimately to unite with whatever remains of the party (applause), and I will tell you why, and I will be brief; I have only five minutes.

I say in the first place, there is a certain charm in unity which always redounds to the benefit of the movement. I know today of thousands of workingmen, especially of the foreigners, who do not know our issues. The German Socialist Federation, the Polish Socialist Society, the Lithuanian Socialist Society and others do not join the organized Socialist movement in this country, because they cannot decide between the two parties intelligently. (Applause.) I know of a number of individuals who say, because they do not know any better, "I will not join the movement as long as you are divided between yourselves," and I say, that for those outside Socialists, unity will mean a good deal.

I say more. I recognize that the Socialist Labor Party, or its leading element, has been, as Comrade Hanford says, anti-socialistic in its tactics and methods. That is one reason why we, the vast majority of organized Socialists, want to have this small crowd of erring brethren among us so that we can control the tactics. (Applause.) Let me tell you something. The Socialist Labor Party today assembled in national convention, representing 500 men, adopt some ridiculous resolutions against the trade unions. We suffer. The trade unions do not make a fine distinction between our party and theirs, and they say, "The Socialists have taken this and that stand; here it is in black and white," and you go and explain to them that it is a different proposition. I hold, as our German comrades have found out, that where there are differences in the ranks of Socialism, one united party can much better bring forth the expression of the same majority of the party than a divided party can. Furthermore, after

all, why has that argument been heard? Will anybody contend that there is contamination in the name S. L. P., and that every member who belongs there must of necessity be a scab? No. I will say to you in all frankness, when our passion and heat leaves us, when we consider calmly, that with the exception of a sole, single individual, the rank and file of the S. L. P. is as devoted as our party membership. (Applause.)

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I am going to speak against the motion. My friend from Washington may laugh, but there is one thing sure, after every convention that Goebel goes to they don't have to guess as to what side of any question Goebel is on. He at least is no trimmer and no dodger.

Comrade Chairman and comrades, I come from New Jersey, and I come under instructions to fight every proposition looking to unity in this convention. (Applause.) Why do I come here fighting "unity"? Because we want unity, and we have discovered by experiment, actual experiment, that you don't get harmony by putting two roosters in the same cage. (Laughter.) Now, we have a proposition that means what? It says that we shall allow the states to take up this question if they see fit. Comrade Strickland has told you something that you want to remember before you pass that resolution. You have already been told they have got no state autonomy. If that is the case, why should we debate live seconds about a plan that involves state autonomy? In my state they came in the name of peace and brotherhood and unity, and they said, "Let us confer." We conferred, and as a result of the conference we had on our hands one of the biggest scraps that we have had in all our history. (Applause.) We are not sorry we have had the scrap, because, after all, comrades, we learned something that we did not know before, and that was the reason for the existence of two Socialist parties. We had the Socialist Labor Party. Presently you hear of the Social Democratic Party. Did it spring into life because any man in his wisdom wanted it? No, because there were essential differences as to tactics. I speak as a man that was never in the Socialist Labor Party. I have no bitterness and no hatred. I pride myself on never having said a harsh word against Daniel DeLeon or the S. L. P.

I have said the Socialist Party and Socialist Labor Party fight two fights against capitalism; and while I recognize that there were some here who did not know that there were differences and regarded the organizations as two separate parties, those differences still continue. What are they, briefly? We disagreed on our trade union policy. We of the Socialist Party changed as to our attitude on the trade union policy in favor of that of the Socialist Labor Party?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. GOEBEL: I maintain no. We differed on the matter of private ownership of the party press. Have we essentially changed on that proposition?

A DELEGATE: Yes.

DEL. GOEBEL: I maintain no. We differed again as to whether we would have a closely centralized plan of organization or state autonomy, as far as consistent with Socialist principles, giving every state freedom to work out its own individual initiative. Have we changed our attitude on that? No, because we have state autonomy in this constitution and have added to our ranks in Washington and many states that used to oppose it.

On all these three points we stand where we used to stand. If that is the case, I maintain that all those that are in the Socialist Labor Party have got to do is to say whether they believe in the kind of tactics that we believe in. If they do, let them sign an application card. If they are not willing to sign that card, if they want us to go out with waving banners and a brass band to meet them, it means after all that while they talk about not humiliating us, they want us to humiliate ourselves by getting on our stomachs and begging them to join our party. (Applause.)

This is my word to you: We are right or we are wrong in our tactics. I maintain that every day, every week, every month since these differences in the two parties came into existence has proven the wisdom of our tactics. They have gone down. Why? You don't dare to say that it is because of lack of self-sacrifice and of zeal on their part. They have even more self-sacrifice than we have in the Socialist Party. Why is it that they have gone down? Simply because their tactics and methods were

not adapted to the needs of American Socialism.

Why have we gone up? Why have we developed strength and power? Why have we got the ear of the trade unions? Why has our party press developed and our party membership grown? Because our tactics have been right; that is the reason. And if they have been right and we have grown under them, in the name of God and common sense why should we change those tactics? (Here the gavel fell.)

So I say, boys, with no hard feelings, if you want to come in, come in, but we are not losing sleep trying to drag you in. (Applause.)

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): The last speaker, Del. Goebel, has given us an argument in the name of God. All right, that is a sufficient reason. Another one against unity was a comrade by the name of Snyder, who accused the other fellows of actually being personal against DeLeon, but we are not personal. Del. Hanford is against unity, against the S. L. P. as a scab organization.

A DELEGATE: That is right.

DEL. KAPLAN: Wait a moment. Comrades, I do not believe I have been personal at any time upon this floor, and yet Comrade Hanford himself told me it was a shame and disgrace to Minnesota to send a man like me to this convention, because I stand for this. He is not personal, you know.

DEL. HANFORD: I did not say it in the convention. I said it to you personally.

DEL. KAPLAN: You stated it to me privately.

DEL. HANFORD: Yes, and meant it. DEL. KAPLAN: You said it privately, that is the same thing. Comrade Spargo is against unity. He is not prejudiced. You saw it yesterday morning. He is going to convince you, as he has the last word, you know, after me. That is, he will try. I mention him because I am not personal. Unfortunately I am against unity because he is a proletarian scientist, you know that.

Comrades, the question is, as I said at the outset, "Is the Socialist Labor Party a Socialist party?"

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. KAPLAN: If it is not, why are they permitted a seat on the floor of the International Congress? (Applause.) Here is the resolution of the Interna-

tional Congress: "In order to get the working class to act as a force in the struggle against capitalism it is indispensable that in each country there should be but one Socialist Party against the capitalist party, just as there is one proletariat." (Applause.) Therefore, all comrades of all factions and organizations which claim to be Socialists, assuming they are, have an imperative duty to do all in their power to bring about Socialist unity of all forces.

A DELEGATE: The point is to re-

member that. DEL. KAPLAN: Now, comrades, you do not hear the man who is attacked trying talking against unity. Carey was attacked. I am not talking for Carey, but he don't stand with you men against unity, does he? Comrade Debs was attacked at one time, and yet Debs, after he heard that the Socialist Labor Party had declared for a conference, went down to New York and said, "I am glad of it. I am glad to know that they have come to us." (Applause.) When the history of the future will be recorded and the Socialist co-operative commonwealth will have been established, I contend that the names that will stand out brightest amongst all Socialists will be the names of those who will have shown that they were above personalities and had as a single object the welfare of the movement. If I have been personal in any way I apologize for it, but I am sincere.

Comrades, there are 6,000 men in the Italian Socialist Federation, from reports that I have got. Those men tell me that they will not unite with either the S. L. P. or the S. P. until the two parties themselves unite, and they say also this: "Whenever you have got together, then we will join your party." Comrades, there are fully 50,000 men who were formerly connected with both of our parties. I do not claim or pretend to claim that all these men have gone out of the movement just because of the attacks mentioned, but I do contend that a great portion of those men would realign themselves when we get together or when they once see 'at we ourselves have settled those differences, and I say we can settle those differences if we eliminate the personalities by meeting one another with the fraternal greeting of fellowship and addressing each

other as comrade and brother. It was Comrade Debs, and I believe it was right here upon this platform that he said, "We will be brothers and comrades; let us get together." I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you adopt the first minority report, let it be known by saying aye. Contrary, no. The votes have it. (Division called for.) All in favor of adopting the first minority report, let it be known by raising your hands. All who are opposed to adopting the report, raise your hands until counted. The vote is 48 for and 131 against the adoption of the report.

DEL. KAPLAN: I will say that I won't bolt. I am a Socialist. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We now come to the main report of the committee. We will have it read in your hearing. Every one be quiet while it is read.

Asst. Sec. Strickland read the majority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? (Question called for.) If you favor the resolution, let it be known by saying aye. Contrary, no. The ayes have it.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): I rise to make a motion. Whereas, the Socialist party in convention at this moment have passed a resolution inviting all the members of the Socialist Labor Party to unite with the Socialist party, I move you, now that it has been carried so nearly unanimously, that we make it absolutely unanimous without one dissenting voice, so there will be no more friction when they come into the Socialist party. Objection was heard.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PLATFORM.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from the Committee on Platform. DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.), reporting for the Committee on Platform: Mr. Chairman and delegates, the report of the Platform Committee is divided into three parts, as you will see. The first part, the preamble, is practically correct in the main as printed in the Daily Socialist. There are one or two very small verbal changes. The other portions were, as I said this morning, only the report of the subcommittee to this general committee. All the changes

that were afterwards made are not very extensive, and you can make them on the paper; so we did not have it reprinted.

It was decided to present the platform practically in three separate sections: a preamble, being the regular statement of the principles of Socialism; a second portion, which might be called an indictment of capitalism; and a third portion, what is commonly called the immediate demands. Now, I do not know whether it is necessary for me to read that preamble or not. It is practically correct. DELEGATES: Read it.

DEL. SIMONS: All right. I suppose that is what you want. I don't want to take up time, for I find my voice is failing. I will turn this matter over to Strickland.

The preamble was read by Asst. Sec. Strickland in full, as follows:

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

"Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only when these are assured are freedom, culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing and shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land by itself does not satisfy human needs. Human labor gets raw materials and food out of the soil by creating machinery and using it upon the land. Whoever has control of land and machinery has control of human labor, and with it of human life and liberty.

"Today the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, it does not make its owners so powerful that they can dominate the sources of life of others. But when machinery becomes more and more complex and expensive, and requires for its effective operation the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wider and wider circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.

"In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point, where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employ-

ing workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of the industrial masters.

"The more the economic power of the ruling class grows, the less useful does it become in the life of the nation. The overwhelming bulk of the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the classes that either have no other productive property but their manual and mental labor power—the wage workers—or that have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power—the small traders and small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic.

"A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting propertied classes on the one hand and the exploited, propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reform of the present order or from the dominant class of society.

"The wage workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They are also the class which suffers most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a small number of capitalists is permitted to use all the country's resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessities of our lives the object of their competitive private enterprises and speculations, is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

"In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate production for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly undermined, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

"The climaxes of this chaotic system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

"In its mad and reckless race for profits the capitalist class is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism

keeps the masses of workmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It wantonly disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

"To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominating parties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select our executives, bribe our legislatures and corrupt our courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They sway our educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially.

"The struggle between wage workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage working class, therefore, has the most vital and direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workingmen will free not only their own class, but also all other classes of modern society: The small farmer, who is today exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than the wage laborer; the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is that at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

"The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation, is the rock upon which class rule is built; political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation

without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

"The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within the very bosom of present capitalist society. The factory system, with its immense machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process, while the great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have had the effect of organizing the work and management of some of our main industries on a national scale, and fitting them for national use and operation.

"In the struggle for freedom the interests of the workers of all nations are identical. The struggle is not only national but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

"To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man."

The reading of the preamble was followed by applause.

DEL. SIMONS: That is the first portion. Does the convention want to consider it part by part?

DELEGATES: Yes.

DEL. SIMONS: Then I move you the adoption of this first portion of the preamble. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt the present preamble as it has been read.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I desire to offer the following amendment. That clause of the platform meets my approval, with this exception. I cannot now take time to give you the number of the paragraph. Down about two-thirds of the way in the first column on the second page of the paper I find these words: "To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public

conscience. They control the dominating parties and, through them, the elected public officials." That is all right, that sentence. Here is the objectionable part: "They select our executives, bribe our legislatures and corrupt our courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They sway our educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially." Now I move that that clause,

"They select our executives, bribe our legislatures and corrupt the so-called courts of justice," be amended to read this way: "They select the executives of the government, they bribe the legislatures and corrupt the so-called courts of justice." I move that amendment.

A DELEGATE: Changing the word "our" to "the."

The motion was put on the adoption of the amendment, and it was declared carried. A division was called for.

DEL. HOGAN: I object to putting that matter before discussion. I simply proposed the amendment and it was seconded. I take—

DEL. SIMONS: A word of explanation that will perhaps clear this matter up. It was an oversight of mine for which I apologize to the convention. I wish to say that we did not get time to have the platform ready in all details as to style, and we wanted to ask of you that you elect from the floor three persons to edit this platform, with the understanding that they were to make no changes in the matter and make no changes without they were all unanimous in each change; no change even as to the letter or a word but what would add smoothness, so that they would only have to look after the literary style. I think it can be done better in that way. As you know, the comrades worked all night last night, and I worked pretty nearly all night too, and we did not get it read over carefully.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): I want the word "justice" stricken out entirely. I have been before the courts.

THE CHAIRMAN: All that are in favor of the amendment lift your hands and hold them until counted by the teller. All opposed to the amendment, lift your hands until counted. The vote is 140 in favor, 11 against.

DEL. OHARE (Okla.): I make this motion as a suggestion; that after the last paragraph where it states that it is

the purpose of the Socialist party to unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers, etc., and "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but to free all humanity from class rule," etc., I move that after that we add "through the substitution of collective ownership and democratic management of the collectively used instruments of production and distribution." I move that this suggestion be referred to this committee, this proposed committee, if it finds a second.

DEL. SIMONS: It may be referred without a motion.

The motion of Del. O'Hare was put and lost.

DEL. STROBEL (N. J.): I move to strike out the seventh paragraph on the second page, "The climaxes of this chaotic system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years." That is not so, comrades. Today we are living in a state of feudalism, and the panic that was brought on here and the panics that may be brought on in the future are by the direct will and action of the capitalist class. They have so organized industry and production—

A DELEGATE: No.

DEL. STROBEL:—while here they are putting the reason for these panics as at the behest of a blind, irresponsible force, when it is the capitalist class that is to blame for it all. Why should we not say what we mean? Why should we not correct this and put it right? I move that this be referred back to the committee also.

The motion was seconded, but was lost.

DEL. STROBEL: My motion was that it be referred to the Committee on Platform, not a new committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you insist, Comrade Strobel, that we put the motion the other way?

DEL. STROBEL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was simply the result of us not understanding which committee you wanted it referred to.

The motion was again put, and was lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, a motion is in order to elect a committee of three at the suggestion of Comrade

Simons, to look over this document. That is the Platform Committee's suggestion.

DEL. KRUEGER (Wash.) I move that the platform be referred back to the same committee.

DEL. HILLQUTT: As a member of the Platform Committee I will say that the idea of mine was that we want the committee to have more than twenty-four hours' time. Now, we have drawn up this draft for you during the night and in the hurry in the morning at the breakfast table. This is going to serve us for a number of years, and we cannot be careful enough in the revision of every part of it as far as style is concerned. If you will refer it back to the same committee, the work to be done at the same convention, you can gain nothing by it. We want to have three men, each to have a chance to take it up carefully, to go over it line by line and compare notes and agree upon a final reading before they give it out to the world as an official program of the Socialist party.

DEL. TUCC (Cal.): A point of order. The motion to elect a committee of three is out of order because there is a motion before the house to adopt the program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken.

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I want to offer an amendment and ask a question, what is meant by the next to the last paragraph in the first column, the paragraph beginning with the words in the last part of the paragraph, "The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective ownership for private ownership of the land and the means of production used for exploitation."

DEL. SIMONS: There is an extra word in there. The first word "ownership" should be stricken out, and it should properly read like this. It will simply show the emphasis a little plainer: "The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and the means of production used for exploitation."

DEL. HAGEL (Okla.): I just wanted to find out about the words "used for exploitation." Land and machinery, is

there any distinction? The land and machinery of the capitalist class, and it all used for exploitation?

THE CHAIRMAN: This comrade is asking for a point of information. Of course, if you go to discussing the merits of the question, if they give consent you may do so.

DEL. HAGEL: I ask that the last three words in that paragraph be stricken out, the words "used for exploitation." (Seconded.)

DEL. WORK (Iowa): I oppose the motion. All we want is the collective ownership of the land and the other means of production and distribution that are used for exploitation. The object of Socialism is to stop exploitation, and we only want the collective ownership of those things which are used for exploitation. That is all we need in order to carry out our object.

DEL. BOOMER (Wash.): I wish to make an amendment if it is in order. In adopting this preamble in this platform we ought to consider it very carefully and not begrudge whatever time may be taken up in carefully and slowly considering every paragraph in it. Now, for a number of years I have been one of the soapbox orators and after this convention is over I expect to spend a number of months on the soap box again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you desire to make a motion?

DEL. BOOMER: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please make it. DEL. BOOMER: I am coming to it. There are two clauses in this preamble that I wish to have either explained or I wish to amend them. When you read them together they contradict each other. It is the last complete paragraph on the first column of the second page. In the middle of that paragraph it says: "The wage workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power," etc. In the last paragraph of that preamble, the last half of the last paragraph—

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): A point of information. Is it not a fact that we are now trying to dispose of the last three words of that paragraph?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DEL. BROWER: What is the use of having two or three others injected into this discussion?

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of

order is well taken. We will now have a vote on this paragraph.

DEL. BOOMER: I asked you if I could make an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you wanted to make one in addition to the one already made.

The question was put on the substitute of Del. Hagel, and it was lost.

DEL. BOOMER: After stating "The wage worker cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power" etc., it goes on in the last paragraph of the preamble, and in the middle it says this: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule." I claim that those two sentences contradict each other. I have been trying ever since I have been on the platform and on the soapbox to tell the working class that the object of Socialism was to substitute working class rule and working class government for capitalist class government (applause), and I want to know where I am at, after this is adopted and I go out again to talk and they ask me, "How are you Socialists going to do this and that?" I simply think we ought to eliminate that statement where it says we are not going to substitute working class government for capitalist class government. How else can we bring in the cooperative commonwealth unless we first set up a working class government and put out the capitalist class government? I move to strike out this part of that section where it says that we do not intend to substitute working class government for capitalist class government. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded—

DEL. STRICKLAND: Read it as it is there.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then read the amendment.

DEL. SIMONS: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but to free humanity from class rule." I believe Comrade Boomer has seen the book called the Communist Manifesto. That phrase is taken almost word for word from it.

DEL. BRADFORD (Cal.): I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment, to insert there "as an ultimate aim" after that statement. (Seconded.)

DEL. HUNTER (N. Y.): I think that by putting the word "only" in so as to read "only strive," the sentence reading "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not only strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule," it will clear it up. It happens that this exact sentence was written not only in the Communist Manifesto, but in the first preamble of the International, and was written by the hand of Karl Marx himself.

DEL. BOOMER: I accept that amendment.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): I am surprised that a man who believes in the International Socialist party should object to that clause in the platform of the Socialist party. We maintain that we do propose to substitute working class rule for capitalist rule, but in the substitution of working class rule for capitalist rule the capitalists themselves in that age will become workers, and we destroy class rule and we establish a government for all humanity. (Applause.) We are simply not going to reverse the conditions we have now; we do not propose to put the working class into power and give them an opportunity to exploit another class in society by making the capitalist class the subservient class, but we propose to destroy class rule and substitute working class rule, and everybody will be part of the government so that it will be the rule of all humanity. I believe the platform is all right as it is, and it should read as it is. (Applause.) I have heard objections made to the propaganda of the Socialist party on that very proposition. They say, "What are you going to do with the capitalist class when you substitute working class rule?" And we have had to qualify repeatedly, owing to the position of many agitators who went out over the country, owing to the speakers themselves not understanding the statements which they attributed to Karl Marx. Karl Marx is all right, but we had to have a working class before we had a Karl Marx. Let us understand working class philosophy in the way Karl Marx did, and then there will be harmony.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I am not going to make a speech on this. There is something further along in this platform that needs fixing, but so far as

this is concerned, Comrade Hunter's suggestion—

DEL. REILLY: A point of order, that he cannot offer motions to amend other portions of the platform when one is under discussion.

DEL. LEWIS: I am not offering one. I have not offered any motion. I am speaking to Comrade Hunter's suggestion. The last time we rushed the platform through without criticism or amendment, and we paid the penalty for it. So far as I am concerned I think this is entirely unobjectionable. I think this clause as it stands is in complete harmony with the Socialist philosophy as it is taught in every standard book of Socialist literature. Comrade Hunter's suggestion of inserting the word "only" would develop a contradiction in this sentence which does not now exist. The point is as stated by the delegate from Ohio, Comrade Prevey, that when the working class becomes the dominant class it ceases to be a working class and it becomes the human race. (Applause.)

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I agree with the comrade from Washington. It is true that when the working class takes possession of the powers of government it will be its mission to abolish capitalism and abolish all classes. But it is also true, as recognized by all authorities on Socialism that it will take some time for the working class to achieve it, and that capitalism in some forms will continue to exist, and it will be the duty of the working class to abolish it, and that will not be done in one day or two days, either. Therefore it is not the aim of the Socialist party and it will not be the function of the Socialist party to entirely destroy capitalism and entirely abolish classes. It will be the aim of Socialism—it is the aim, the ultimate aim of the Socialist movement, that is true; and therefore I am in favor of expressing the philosophy and also the aim of Marx. They all speak for Marx here; I also speak for Marx, and I am in favor of amending that clause to read—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion to amend and one to amend the amendment.

DEL. SLOBODIN: As a substitute for the whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

DEL. SLOBODIN: That "In this battle for freedom it is the ultimate

aim of the Socialist movement not to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule," etc. (Seconded.)

The substitute was put and lost.

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): I move to make this read this way: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party strives to substitute working class rule only to the end that all humanity be freed from class rule, and to the realization of the international brotherhood of man." That is the proposition. (Seconded.)

The substitute of Del. Toole was put and lost.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I have a substitute what is a substitute. (Laughter.) If you will listen to me a moment you will adopt this substitute. I recognize the fact that in stating this matter thus partially some, and a majority, of the delegates are not pleased. In fact, taking that paragraph and other paragraphs in connection, a seeming contradiction is involved. If you will allow me to move the substitution of this paragraph to read as follows it will suit you: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party shall strive to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man."

THE CHAIRMAN: Lost for want of a second.

DEL. MAYNARD (Colo.): Is it the understanding that there is not an amendment to the amendment? The comrade over there accepted the amendment of Comrade Hunter. I do not care which way you vote it, as a substitute or as an amendment; the chair will choose which it is; but I would have you insert these three words after "capitalist class rule," "but by working class victory to free all humanity." That is all right, to my mind, but if this convention finds it ambiguous, what in the world will ignorant men outside do? But I say these three words would avoid all ambiguity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Read it as it would then sound.

DEL. HOGAN: Was there a second to my motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

A DELEGATE: Yes, there was

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear any second. If he insists that the motion was seconded I will put the question.

The motion on the amendment of Del. Hogan was put and lost.

DEL. MAYNARD: With my amendment it would read: "In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but by working class victory to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man."

DEL. STRICKLAND: Second.

ASST. SEC. REILLY then read the substitute of Del. Maynard, which was carried by a vote of 94 to 52.

DEL. DORSAY (Mass.), moved the previous question, and it was seconded and declared carried.

The Declaration of Principles as amended was then put and carried.

DEL. SIMONS: The rest of the platform is an analysis of the present conditions.

The platform proper was then read, as follows:

PLATFORM OF 1908.

"The Socialist party, in national convention assembled, in entering upon the campaign of 1908, again presents itself to the people as the party of the working class, and as such it appeals for the support of all workers of the United States and of all citizens who sympathize with the great and just cause of labor.

"We are at this moment in the midst of one of those industrial breakdowns that periodically paralyze the life of the nation. The much-boasted era of our national prosperity has been followed by one of general misery. Factories, mills and mines are closed, work is abandoned, and millions of men, ready, willing, and able to provide the nation with all the necessities and comforts of life are forced into idleness and starvation. Within recent times the trusts and monopolies have attained an enormous and menacing development. They have acquired the power to dictate to us the terms upon which we shall be allowed to live. The trusts fix the prices of our bread, meat and sugar, of our coal, oil and clothing, of our raw material and machinery, of all the necessities of life and even the prices of our coffins.

"The ruling class has seized upon the present desperate condition of the workers as an opportunity for a re-

newed onslaught on the organized labor movement. The highest courts of the country have within the last year rendered decision after decision depriving the workers of rights which they had won by generations of struggle.

"The attempt to destroy the Western Federation of Miners, although defeated by the solidarity of organized labor and the Socialist movement, revealed the existence of a far-reaching and unscrupulous conspiracy on the part of the ruling powers against the organizations of labor.

"In their efforts to take the lives of the faithful leaders of the miners the conspirators violated the state laws and the federal constitution in a manner seldom equaled even in a country so completely dominated as is the United States by the profit-seeking class.

"The congress of the United States has shown its contempt for the interests of labor as plainly and unmistakably as have the other branches of government. The legislation for which the labor organizations have continuously petitioned has been rejected. The scant legislation apparently passed for their benefit has been so distorted as to injure those whom it pretended to help.

"The working class of the United States cannot expect any remedy for its wrongs from the present ruling class or from the dominant parties. So long as a small number of individuals are permitted to use the common resources of the nation's wealth for their private profit in competition with each other and for the exploitation of their fellowmen, industrial depressions are bound to occur at certain intervals. No currency reform or other legislative measure proposed by capitalist reformers can avail against these fatal results of a system of utter anarchy in production.

"So long as the wealth production of the country is based on individual competition the fierce struggles of this competition will inevitably lead to combinations and trusts. No amount of government regulation, or of publicity, or of restrictive legislation will arrest the natural course of modern industrial development.

"So long as our courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling classes and their agents, our government will be used in

the interests of these classes as against the toilers.

"Political parties are but the expression of economic class interests. The Republican, the Democratic, and the so-called 'Independence' parties and all parties other than the Socialist party, are financed, directed and controlled by the representatives of different groups of the ruling class.

"In the maintenance of class government both the Democratic and Republican parties have been equally guilty. The Republican party has had control of the national government and has been directly and actively responsible for these wrongs. The Democratic party, while saved from direct responsibility by its political impotence, has shown itself equally subservient to the aims of the capitalist class wherever and wherever it has been in power. The old chattel slave-owning aristocracy of the south, which was the backbone of the Democratic party, has been supplanted by a child slave plutocracy. In the great cities of our country the Democratic party is allied with the criminal element or with the Republican party in maintaining the interest of the possessing class.

"The various 'reform' movements and parties which have sprung up within recent years are but the clumsy expression of widespread popular discontent with the present system of exploitation and graft. They are not based on an intelligent understanding of the historical development of civilization and of the economic and political needs of our time. They are bound to perish as the numerous middle class reform movements of the past have perished."

DEL. SIMONS: I move you the adoption of the platform. (Seconded.)

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I think there is a good deal of unnecessary confusion in one paragraph here. At the foot of the second column on the second page, third paragraph from the bottom, we find this: "So long as our courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling classes and their agents, our government will be used in the interests of these classes as against the toilers." I believe that we ought to make this a little bit more distinct. It has been the contention of the Socialist party and the Socialist expon-

ents on the platform for a number of years, that we are fast approaching a time—aye, have reached that time—when there are but two classes in society, and we confuse the issue by claiming that we have these classes. The paragraph should read: "So long as the courts, legislatures and executive officers remain in the hands of the ruling class and their agents, the government will be used in the interests of this class as against the toilers." I move the adoption of this clause as last read. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: That suggestion is accepted by the committee, I understand. If there is no objection the committee will accept the suggestion.

A delegate suggested changing "our" courts to "the" courts, and "our" government to "the" government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee accept?

DEL. HILLQUIT: As to the last suggestion, I do not accept, and I want to say we made a very grave mistake before by accepting something similar. Now, there is absolutely no use and no sense in separating ourselves from the American people and the American country. If we do that, we have no standing in court at all. If we say "the government," not "our government," "the nation" of which we form no part and we object to "ours," then they might well ask, "What is coming to you in this case if you have nothing to do with it, if you form no part of the nation, and why do you want to reform that nation or any part of its institutions at all?" I say that we, the Socialist party, are going to keep our place. (Applause.) I say it is our government, our courts, I maintain it is not the government and the courts of the Socialist party, but the government and the courts of the people of the United States, of which we constitute a part, for which we speak, for which we demand certain reforms. (Applause.)

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): As one of the committee I also protest against the change. You cannot deny the existence of the middle class. And by simply declaring here that it ought not to exist, it will not cease to exist. You cannot do that by resolution. As long as it is a fact that there is still a middle class you have to recognize the fact. Why should we cut out any mention of it in the platform? The two classes in this

other sentence are mentioned together. I join with my colleague in protesting against this change.

DEL. BERTHA M. STARK-WEATHER (Cal.): Comrade Chairman, in the last paragraph, "As measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for the realization of this ultimate aim," I want to ask the Platform Committee what ultimate aim they have mentioned? There is no mention of an ultimate aim yet. They have merely given the grievances, and given them magnificently, but they have mentioned no ultimate aim. Here they mention an ultimate aim.

THE CHAIRMAN: You ask for information?

DEL. STARKWEATHER: I do, from the Platform Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The ultimate aim is the freedom of the whole human race.

DEL. O'HARE: Let me state that I have just asked Comrade Branstetter, a member of the committee, and Comrade Simons about that point. There is evidently a rhetorical error there, and Comrade Simons will answer that in a moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Simons has the floor.

DEL. SIMONS: I will let you answer, Comrade Hillquit.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I wish to state that the point is very well taken.

DEL. SIMONS: That is what I think.

DEL. HILLQUIT: The fact of the matter is that we had another paragraph in front of that, which stated the ultimate aim. Then when we assembled in the back room we took that paragraph and transferred it to the end, without making a change to correspond. There will be a few more places of the same kind which will require revision. This is one.

DEL. WHEAT (Cal.): I desire to take issue with the comrades who have spoken regarding the ruling classes. It is not true that there are two classes of exploiters in this country. The capitalist class has done away with the middle class. There was a time when the old feudal class was in existence, and the capitalist exploiters came in as a middle class. But today the exploitation is done entirely by the capitalist class.

DEL. TOOLE: Big or little.

DEL. WHEAT: Big and little to-

gether. They exploit in one and the same way. It is capitalist exploitation that has driven every other form of exploitation out of the world, and that is the reason why the working class can now come forward with some chance for victory, because it is face to face with the single dominant exploiting class, with no middle class to fog the issue in any way, shape or manner.

I desire to move, if I may be permitted, that the suggestion that was offered by one of the comrades here that the plural be changed to the singular, be adopted. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the plural exchange to the singular be adopted.

DEL. WHEAT: And I desire to add also—I neglected to do as I intended to—to also make a motion that “our” be changed to “the” in the same paragraph. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read that as it will read provided the motion to amend carries.

SEC. REILLY: If this is adopted the paragraph will read as follows: “So long as the courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling class and its agents, the government will be used in the interests of this class as against the toilers.”

DEL. ANDERSON (Minn.): A point of order. Comrade Williams made that motion originally, and it was seconded, and I would like to have the question divided so that we can vote on each clause by itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair failed to hear a second to the motion of the comrade.

DEL. BERGER: I want to speak on behalf of the committee. I do not think that after we worked for a day and a half continuously—now we should go back on our work and have it undone without defense—especially since we are right. (Laughter.) I will again say that the mere fact that you here will not abolish the middle class. The mere fact that a comrade from California says that there is no middle class, that there are only two classes—the capitalists and the proletarians, does not make it so. All you have to do is to go to any village, town or smaller city, and you will find that there is a middle class. And even you who are denying the existence of a middle class are, on the

other hand, continually talking about the middle class and about middle-class reformers. You also claim that the Democratic party is the representative of the middle class is still the largest class in deny its existence. You shut your eyes and deny that it exists. I tell you the middle class, and at the same time you existence today. The farmers and small tradesmen are at least twenty times more in number than the capitalists. The capitalist class is very small. The middle class is still a very considerable part of the population of this country, and a very considerable part of the population of any civilized country. That is why we say, in order to have a class-conscious, clear-cut platform, we must mention the two classes besides the proletariat. That is all, and I cannot see why the so-called radicals from California, the people who try to appear as ultra-class-conscious, deny the existence of a middle class. I always thought that you claim out there that we in the middle west are middle class Socialists. Now, if there is no middle class, how can there be middle class Socialists? (Applause.) I even suspect that most of these impossible comrades from the coast belong themselves to the middle class. (Laughter.) I will also say that a party like the one we have in Milwaukee—85 per cent of our organization is made up of workmen—such a party, I say, is just the one that will look things and conditions square in the eye and state them as they are. Comrades, I ask you not to change the wording of the draft, but instead I would suggest that to the following sentence:

“measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for the realization of the ultimate aim, we add ‘the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution.’” I say we add these five or six words, “the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution.”

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you make that as a substitute?

DEL. BERGER: I am not making a motion. I will let you make the motion. However, I will also call attention to the fact that at the end of the entire platform we say that all our planks are only steps taken in the amelioration of the present system and that no proletarian should rest until we get complete control of the means of production and distribution.

The motion to amend was lost. DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I want to insist that the question be divided.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you have a motion to make?

DEL. WILLIAMS: No, I wish to speak on the last amendment by this comrade from California.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment made by the comrade from California was lost.

DEL. WILLIAMS: That original motion, Comrade Chairman, but I made this motion for the particular reason that I like to see at least some degree of consistency in a Socialist platform as well as in any other document. Of course, I understand that Comrade Berger is right, for he has told us so (laughter), and the committee is no doubt all right or they would not tell us so. We have the committee telling us in one part of this platform that the capitalist class “own and censor the press.” They sway our educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually, just as they own it industrially. Now, if the capitalist class owns the country and if the capitalist class own it politically, industrially, intellectually, and every other way, how is it then possible that we have other classes also owning it? (Applause.) This motion is the only one that is consistent with the remainder of the platform. If this part that we first read is true and is not a lie, the last part of it is a mistake. The one is necessary in order to the efficiency and consistency of the remainder of it.

DEL. STROBEL (N. J.): I ask your patience and consideration just a minute. I am going to move to strike out a paragraph in this platform. The portion I move to have stricken out, I do it now in order to impress upon your attention something which you ought to know and not throw overboard recklessly, thinking it meant nothing, because there is a great deal of meaning in this claim. I move to strike out this paragraph: “We are at this moment in the midst of one of those industrial breakdowns that periodically paralyze the life of the nation.” I think these scientists who built this platform must have been hypnotized by a set of phrases. Now, you want to look at this very carefully. We are no longer in the formative stage of capitalism. We have arrived at a stage where every-

thing goes by rule and method. We do not bring on panics because there is an industrial depression behind them, but panics are brought on today by the will of the capitalist class. If I had more time I could state to you, but you know as well as I do that this last panic is not the result of any industrial depression, of any industrial cause. They brought it on as panics at no preceding time were brought on. This panic was brought on by the deliberate will of the capitalist class to achieve for themselves the three or four things that they set out to gain. I want you to realize that there is nothing—not simply the idea that we want to push this matter, but people have come to me on the floor and said this thing ought to be discussed and must be taken up. I move therefore that this paragraph be stricken out. (Seconded.)

The motion to strike out was put and lost.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER (Okla.): With the consent of the committee I would like to suggest that this last paragraph of the platform be changed by substituting “its” instead of “this.” If we correct that discrepancy it would then read: “As measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim,” we demand the following, etc. And as Comrade Berger explained, there is a further declaration as to what the ultimate aim is, at the end of the demand. I make that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the committee accept the suggestion of Comrade Branstetter?

DEL. C. L. FURMAN (N. Y.): I move to strike out the following: “The trusts fix the prices of our bread, meat and sugar, of our coal, oil and clothing,” to strike out those words so as to make it read—

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house to refer this to an editing committee of three.

DEL. FURMAN: This particular sentence?

THE CHAIRMAN: The whole platform.

DEL. FURMAN: Then I wish to call their attention to that sentence.

DEL. HILLOUT: I desire to amend the motion; not that we refer it to a committee, but that we adopt the declaration of principles and plat-

farm, and that we elect a committee of three to edit the style of both.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I accept that substitute.

DEL. HILLOUT: In other words, we are adopting at once. That committee so elected will finish its labors within three weeks and transmit to the National Secretary a revised and final copy of the declaration of principles, platform and program.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I accept that motion.

DEL. BROWER: I move the previous question on the adoption of the platform.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): Does this mean that we should not leave this program as we have it already?

DEL. HILLOUT: No, on the contrary, this committee is to take all suggestions, all offerings, and concern itself with the style and language only, and make no change in the substance.

The previous question was ordered.

THE CHAIRMAN: As many as wish to refer this to an editing committee of three, make it known by saying aye. Contrary, no. It is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move to suspend the order and take it up to-morrow, and to proceed now to the nomination of presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

The motion was seconded. The previous question being moved, was declared carried. A division was called for.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you favor proceeding with the nominations, raise your hands. All opposed. The motion is carried.

DEL. CALLERY (Mo.): I would like to ask if nominations are now in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are.

DEL. STEDMAN: I move that the first ballot be an informal ballot. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion has been made and seconded that the first ballot be an informal ballot. As many as favor the motion make it known by saying aye. Contrary, no. The motion is lost. Del. Callery has the floor.

Nomination of Eugene V. Debs.

DEL. CALLERY: Comrade Chair-

man and Comrade Delegates of the convention: After a session of five days the Socialist party in national convention has at last come to the most important work which it shall be called upon to perform, the nomination of our standard bearers for this campaign of 1908. The Socialist party here in national convention assembled is but the latest expression on the political field, of that historic class struggle that is as old as civilization itself.

The thousands of widowed mothers and fatherless children in all of our great industrial centers, the hundreds of unmarked graves where rest the sacred dust of our martyred comrades, all bear mute testimony to this irrepressible conflict.

As evidence of this, look to Homestead, to Hazelton, to Chicago, to the Coeur d'Alenes and to Colorado; and in every one of these conflicts between the forces of capital and those of labor, the powers of government, whether under the control of the Democratic or Republican party, have always been used to conserve the interests of capital and to crush down labor. So thoroughly has this fact been demonstrated that labor recognizes in order to obtain its freedom, it must organize politically as well as industrially. But the question now is—in what kind of politics will it engage?

Where the leaders of the two great political parties stand with reference to the rights of labor, but brief mention need be made at this time. Let me point out but one instance, that of Colorado. When Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone had been kidnapped upon a perjured requisition from the State of Colorado and left lay in the prisons of Idaho for nearly two years—after they had been denied all of their constitutional rights and were standing in the shadow of the gallows with the millions of the mine owners' association pitted against them, with the Republican governors of two States against them in that critical crisis, Theodore Roosevelt, the Republican President of the United States, so far forgot all regard for justice that he stepped down from his high position and denounced these defenseless working men as "undesirable citizens." And when he did this, he

proved himself to be one of the most despicable cowards in this country. And what stand did W. J. Bryan take, the "Champion of the Great Common People"? For two campaigns, in 1896 and 1900, he went about this country with crocodile tears in his eyes, pleading for the constitutional rights of the Filipinos, and when three of his fellow-countrymen, with all of their constitutional rights outraged, were in the clutches of the mine owners of the West, he said not one word in their behalf, notwithstanding the fact that he had been appealed to time and again by labor bodies all over the country; not one word did he say till the jury in the Haywood case rendered a verdict of "Not guilty," when he condemned himself in his speech at Joliet by saying he was glad the verdict was not guilty—he never thought those men were guilty. He thought more of his personal ambitions that he did of the lives of three of his fellow-countrymen; and Mr. Bryan is the possible candidate of the Democratic party for President.

Where does Taft, the probable candidate of the Republican party, stand on the labor question? Just one instance is all that is necessary upon this point. A short time ago he took a trip through Europe and while in Russia he dined with the Royal family and drank to the health of that bloody butcher, the autocrat of the blackest despotism on all the earth; one who has sent the best men and the noblest women of Russia over the ice-covered plains of Siberia to suffer a slow crucifixion. This is Taft, the "friend of labor," the aspirant for the nomination on the Republican ticket. And so it stands. Thousands of working-men all over this country are conscious of this fact today, and their eyes are upon this convention, asking themselves who our standard bearer will be?

I have the name of a comrade in mind, who, if nominated by this convention, will bring a message of hope to the weary mothers in the sweatshops, the thousands of child slaves in the factories, and to all of those who with tired hands and saddened faces bear the burdens of the world's work. It has been said of this comrade, whose name I am about to men-

tion, that he has made mistakes, to which we answer: "To err is human; to forgive is divine." This comrade bears the battle scars of twenty-five years of service in the labor movement. I wish, comrades, to place before this convention for your consideration, the name of one who is known to us all, our loved and loving comrade, tried and true—Eugene V. Debs, of Indiana.

(The nomination was received with great applause and long continued enthusiastic demonstrations.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): Comrade Chairman, comrades and friends, I rise on behalf of the delegation from the State of New York to second the nomination of Eugene V. Debs of Indiana. (Applause.) I cannot hope to add anything to the eloquent address made by the comrade who placed Debs's name before this convention. I am sure that every delegate of this convention and every comrade present in this hall will agree that the spirit of the nomination, the spirit of the address in which the nomination was made was alike worthy of our loved Comrade Debs and of the best traditions of the Socialist party. (Applause.)

I am sure that we are all agreed that if the spirit and the sentiment of the speech of the delegate who nominated Debs characterize our campaign, the cause of Socialism will not suffer in this great fight of the year 1908. Comrades and friends, I need only ask you to reflect what it is that we most require in our presidential candidate. We need, above everything else, as our standard bearer, a man who will give us back our standard unsullied and unspoil as he takes it; we need a man who will carry it from east to west and from north to south not merely without dishonor, but with the spirit of inspiration and of the revolution of the working class along with it. (Applause.) Eugene V. Debs is not only a man who will carry the spirit of the working class revolution along with its banner; he is the personification of the revolt of the working class in this country. (Applause.)

I look upon Eugene V. Debs not as a man to express the spirit of revolu-

tion, but as the personal embodiment of that revolution itself. (Applause.) Eugene V. Debs drank the genius and passion for liberty from his mother's breasts. (Applause.) Eugene V. Debs not only drank the passion and genius for liberty from his mother's breasts, but he has breathed that genius and that passion with every breath of his own in these twenty-five years. (Applause.)

The hand clasp of Eugene V. Debs to his wearied comrade wherever he finds him is as the shower of rain upon the parched earth. The very presence of Eugene V. Debs is the greatest inspiration I know for the working class movement in this country. (Applause.)

New York has no favorite son to present for this position. New York does not desire that one of its members should be chosen. It has a favorite comrade, a comrade endeared to New York by all his long service to this great cause of the working class, and that comrade, Eugene V. Debs, will, I am confident, go through this campaign as he has gone through other campaigns, towering above all other candidates, not merely in ability, not merely in capacity as a campaigner, but in the deep fundamental character that we are seeking for. (Applause.)

You tell me that my comrade Debs has made mistakes. You tell me that my comrade Debs is not perfect. And I answer you back, it is true, but the mistakes of Eugene V. Debs have done him more credit than the right things that many other people have done. (Great applause.) You tell me that Eugene V. Debs is not a god. I answer back, no, but Eugene V. Debs is human and so are we; and because he is human, the most human of us all perhaps in a large sense, I say to you there is no man living today who is better qualified to carry out banner than Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.) When Eugene V. Debs was born I think the morning stars must have sung together. (Applause.) When Eugene V. Debs was cradled I think that the great spirit of liberty must have watched with proud rejoicing and said, "Here is my champion; here is my voice to cry out to all the world and say, as

the prophet said of old, 'Let my people go!'" (Applause.)

Comrade Chairman, when Eugene V. Debs speaks there rises before the gaze of every workman in this country whose heart responds to the yearning for liberty, a vision of breaking chains, a vision of the uprising protesting host marching out of its misery, marching out of its servitude, marching on and on to that great freedom to which we all aspire. Therefore I second the nomination of Eugene V. Debs. (Cheers.)

Nomination of A. M. Simons.

DEL. STEDMAN (Ill.): Mr. Chairman, comrades and delegates, it was not more or only a trifle more than eight years ago that Comrade Berger and myself and one or two others were perhaps more urgent than any other friends who took that man by the hand, and if you please, really forced him upon the political ticket of the Social Democratic party in opposition to thousands, or at least hundreds, who were opposed to him, but upon knowing him, learned to love him. So that when I shall oppose—I will not say oppose, but present the name of another candidate, no one who at least has any recollection of the past shall challenge my admiration, my respect or my affection for Eugene V. Debs. From the time when he was sunstruck down in Virginia and all through, if you please, the two great campaigns that followed, we watched him, and we watched him frequently, pale under the terrific strain of those two great fights. Some few months ago, some of you may not know it, but there was an operation that took place upon his throat. If in this campaign he ever attempts to make a talking campaign he will probably close his existence so far as—

DELEGATES: No.

DEL. STEDMAN: One moment. I understand full well the situation. I understand two things perfectly—that the easiest time to appeal to the emotions of any audience is when they are exhausted; I understand very well that reason retires and emotion remains afterwards. But mark what I say, I am perfectly willing to let a few days or a few months answer the argument which I present. First con-

sider that I admit that a campaign may be made through literature issued from Girard, Kansas. I also admit that he may write a great many articles. (Hisses.)

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I rise to a point of personal privilege. I am a Socialist, and I deny the right of any Socialist to hiss any other Socialist. (Applause, and hissing renewed.)

DEL. STEDMAN: I understand, my comrades—

DEL. TOOLE (Md.): A point of order. I want to know whether it is in order for a man who gets up to nominate another man, to oppose at the same time the nomination of another. And I want to know, further, if so, whether those comrades who nominated Comrade Eugene V. Debs will have a right to reply.

THE CHAIRMAN: They should have that right.

DEL. STEDMAN: I do not object to that opportunity in the least, sir, and I want to say it is very evident that some have misunderstood my reference to a literary campaign. You evidently by your demonstration indicated, if you please, that in my mind was something that was not lingering there at all. What I meant to say was this, if he cannot take the stump he must accomplish it through a literary campaign. If he can take the stump, his name will draw terrific audiences, and, my friends, if you nominate another who by the prestige of your nomination can draw large audiences, do you not double the effectiveness of your campaign? For the greatest tribute you can ever pay to Eugene V. Debs would be to strike him from the possibilities of your coming election.

It may be you want him; no doubt we do. But after all, what is the object of our movement? It must be above everything else to carry the cause of Socialism, its propaganda and its work, to the great mass of people in the United States. If you have a man who can fill a hall, who can secure a great audience by reason of his personality, do you not double the effectiveness by nominating a person who by reason of that nomination can equally draw a great audience?

Do you think, if you please, that possibly by a nomination at this time

you preclude to some extent a nomination four years hence? By no means. And do you think that by nominating for instance another you by any possible process insult even to the slightest degree the party who has been mentioned as a candidate? What are his views? They are these: "When I am commanded I obey." Yet, if you please, his own idea was not that he should be nominated, and I want to read you a letter received from him this morning. I sent a telegram to him asking him to come to the convention because of some reports that I had received. It is as follows:

"Seymour Stedman, Chicago, Ill.—My Dear Steddy:—Telegram sent by yourself, Williams and Berger has been received this moment. I am sorry not to be able to comply with your request. The 'Appeal' has undertaken certain special work of some importance on the strength of my being here, and I cannot well abandon it at this time. I should be happy, of course, to attend the convention and to meet the comrades if the situation were such that I could do so. I see that my friends have again been very kind to me in this matter of nomination. I had hoped that my name would not be mentioned in that connection this year, and have done what I could to discourage it; the reasons for this purely from the party standpoint, seem quite apparent to me. As for myself personally, I never had any ambition along that line—which we all know—"If I do anything worthy of keeping my name alive I prefer that it shall be done as a private in the ranks and not by having my name associated with some public office or with what may seem to be the desire of some public office. With loving regards, etc., I am yours in the same old way, Eugene V. Debs."

Now, I cannot understand why, simply reasoning as to the impending campaign and that which can be made most effective, that you should regard my attitude as one personally offensive. And yet that seems to be the entirely bankrupt in ability as some are inclined to believe it to be. The Democratic party may need its necessary man continuously. It is not absolutely necessary in this party. If

you can have two on the platform, who by virtue, the one of his name and the other by nomination, you double the strength and effectiveness of your party organization.

I want to mention another name for your consideration. At the time Gene, or a little after he finally left the locomotive and commenced his work in the labor movement, another man left the farm and commenced his work, and it has been tremendous work, for the cause. That man took hold of a populist publishing house and through his energy and through his work has developed its proportions so that in a single year under a co-operative plan it disposed of nearly \$30,000.00 worth of Socialist literature. He takes an old populist magazine, and it in turn becomes the International Socialist Review. He is a man who has worked continuously for the movement, and no one can question his ability as an informed speaker, as a good talker, as a persistent writer, and as one who at the present time is serving the Chicago Daily Socialist as its editor; a man who can write; a man who can speak; a man who I feel can fairly and fully and most excellently represent the Socialist movement in the impending campaign. You would have Debs with his meetings; you would have this comrade with his meetings, and you would simply add two great factors together in one instead of limiting it to either one; and for that reason I present to you for your consideration Comrade A. M. Simons. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. O'HARE (Okla.): Mr. Chairman and fellow comrades, I had hoped it would not be necessary for me or for Oklahoma to say a word in behalf of that fearless candidate of the working class, Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.) I had hoped that the friends of Debs would know that he today is able, as able as he has ever been, and more able to defend the cause of the working class from any rostrum in any part of the world. (Applause.) A few days ago I sat in a coach at Girard with the great loving arm of Debs around my waist. I asked him, "Comrade Debs, stay on the train and come with us to Chicago." He said, "No, you do not

need me there. The Socialist movement is now so large that it can spare any man." I said, "Comrade Debs, if you are nominated for the presidency of the United States, you will serve?" He said, "I hope that I will not be nominated. There are many who are more entitled to the nomination than myself." I asked him and I asked Fred D. Warren, "What is the health of Eugene V. Debs?" For eight years I have watched this man, this comrade, with all the love that a younger brother can give to an elder brother, for it was the hand of Eugene V. Debs that welcomed me into the Socialist party eight years ago in Turner Hall in St. Louis (applause), and since then I have recognized him as my elder brother in this movement.

I asked Warren and I asked all the men in Girard, "What is Debs' health?" They said, "Look at his face, look at the shine of health and that loving, inspiring countenance." After one year's rest, after a year without care, he has sat down and pounded a typewriter with no thought of the morrow except to hurl his thunderbolts in the face of Roosevelt and the rest of the capitalist class. Eugene V. Debs is fit, and until I receive a telegram, or this convention receives a telegram, from him saying that he positively declines the nomination, I and the Oklahoma delegation will give our vote for Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.)

It has been charged that the nomination of Eugene V. Debs will not be sane and safe for the Socialist Party; that he stands for terrorism. I say he does stand for terrorism. I say that the capitalist class of America are more in terror of his voice and his pen than of the voice or of the pen of any other man on the American continent. (Applause.) I say, in accordance and in harmony with the thought of our Comrade Spargo, that Eugene V. Debs is the embodiment of the American proletarian movement. (Applause.) He is great, he is uncompromising, he is loving, he is powerful, he is resistless in his work for the working class, he is remorseless in his aim at the complete and uncompromising overthrow of the capitalist system of production. (Applause.) Let me make one point, and then yield the floor. Eugene V. Debs

is well, and he will conduct a campaign from any place that you ask him. (Applause.) But I will say that you must not ask him to make a trip like Comrade Hanford had to make. You must not ask him to make a trip like you did before. It will not kill him, but it would kill any other man in the Socialist movement. (Applause.)

My friends, with all due respect and admiration for Comrade Simons, I wish that he and other nominees who may be named would withdraw their names that we might make this nomination unanimous. (Applause.) Listen; it is not because we have not enough presidential timber in the Socialist party. If Debs should decline, there are a number of comrades who are perfectly capable of carrying the red flag of revolt for the proletarian movement. Not that they are not equal to the occasion, but because if we were to turn down Eugene V. Debs we would be repudiating the policy that he pursued which has made Theodore Roosevelt declare against the Socialist movement (Voices, "no, no"), and declare that we are undesirable citizens. With all due respect to Comrade Simons and to the other comrades that may be nominated, I again affirm the decision of Oklahoma and of the Southwest generally to give our ballot for that man who, as I say, expresses the hopes and aspirations of the workingmen and working women of the Socialist movement of America. I thank you. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. HANFORD (N. Y.): I do not want to abuse the courtesy of Comrade Brower, and therefore will make no remarks on the subject of the nomination, but I would like to say that no matter how much my tongue should speak I could not possibly express what is in my heart. This letter is from Comrade Debs, under date of May 4th. When I arrived in Chicago about a week or ten days before that time, I heard rumors that

Comrade Debs' health was very bad in the latter part of April. One of the first things I heard was that the health of Comrade Debs was very bad. I heard that his throat was so bad that he could not speak for two years. I also heard that he would not accept the nomination under any conditions. Under those circumstances I took it upon myself, not as a delegate to this convention, for I was not at that time elected, but I took it upon myself as a private member of the Socialist Party to write Comrade Debs a very clear, plain, explicit letter asking answers to three questions; first, as to the condition of his throat; second, as to the condition of his physical health generally; and third, as to whether he would accept the nomination of the party if it were tendered him. Comrade Debs answered those questions just as plainly as I put them, and I am going to read you his answer, which was sent me under date of May 4th. I might add that Comrade Stehman had an opportunity to read this letter some time ago:

"As to my throat and general health, I have improved considerably since I have had a chance to lead something like a regular life and get a reasonable amount of rest. I visited a specialist again a few months ago, and he assured me that my throat was greatly improved. At present I feel no ill effects. My general health is about all that could be desired. So far as strength is concerned, I never had more to my credit, if as much. In the coming campaign, however, I would prefer, if I had my choice, to see what I could do with my pen and give my tongue a rest. I feel as if I can write a campaign and make some of the enemy take notice that there are Socialists in the field. (Applause.) Now, I will tell you candidly just how I feel. I have never refused to do, so far as I could, anything the party commanded me to do, and never shall. I have taken the nomination under protest, but I have no desire to run for office and a positive prejudice against the very thought of holding office. To obey the commands of the Socialist party I violated a vow made years ago that I would never again be a candidate for political office. My

whole ambition—and I have a goodly stock of it—is to make myself as big and as useful as I can, as much opposed to the enemy and as much loved by our comrades as any other private in the ranks. You need have no fear that I shall shirk my part in the coming campaign. I shall be in condition, and I hope there will be no good ground for complaint when the fight is over. Very sincerely, Eugene V. Debs." (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Simons.

DEL. BROWER (Ill.): Comrade Chairman and fellow delegates: I yield to no man in the Socialist Party in admiration for our comrade, Eugene V. Debs, but I do hope the Socialist Party, which expresses the solidarity and intelligence that is being organized in the face of the great social structure that shall bring to this country of ours a full-fledged democracy, as its organized expression and unfailing aim in the United States of America, can safely trust its banner in the hands of more than one man in this great party of ours. I want to second the nomination of another candidate. I have seen two campaigns, thoroughly magnificent. The last one especially was a good fight. The campaign of 1908 will be still better. I do not believe there is any argument offered by the supporters of our loved comrade, Eugene V. Debs, in the statement that we would be repudiating the things he stands for if we saw fit to nominate another candidate for president of the United States on this, our ticket. I believe earnestly and honestly that while you can compel Debs to take this place simply by commanding him to go on this ticket as candidate for president, that you may be compelling him to forfeit his life in the near future to meet your present day demands. I want to tell you people tonight, you delegates and the rest of the audience, that I haven't got anything of oratory to bear out this effort of mine. I am not a hero worshiper, and I cannot be led to change my mind by the waving of a banner or the shaking of a hat in the air. I want to tell you men and women tonight that the Socialist Party of America, this

expression of the great international struggle, does not depend upon this party's nominating any one or another of the candidates that may be offered tonight. I do believe also that in making a nomination here for a third consecutive time in the history of this party, the probabilities are that you will be losing a force that you will need in the struggle in the greater campaign of 1912. I do believe that there are enough men in the Socialist Party today, and let us hope within the next four years or eight, that we may be able to name for one of these positions at the head of the ticket. But there are enough men today in the party who have the ability, the courage, the intelligence and the command of this philosophy of ours, that we do not need to be narrowed down to any one candidate when it comes to nominating for president and vice president of the United States; not one or two. I want to second the nomination of A. M. Simons, a man who has given years of his life to this struggle for the upbuilding of the international Socialist movement in America. (Applause.)

Nomination of Carl D. Thompson.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Comrade Chairman and comrades: It is my fate to do unpopular things. I did an unpopular thing fifteen years ago when I succeeded in getting Comrade Debs into the Socialist movement. I did an unpopular thing twelve years ago when I did my very best to start the old Social Democracy together with Comrade Debs. I again did a very unpopular thing by splitting that party at the time they stood for colonization. And about eight years ago, I was also very unpopular because I stood very aggressively for Eugene V. Debs as the presidential candidate of the united Socialist Party. And, comrades, I am going to do something unpopular again tonight.

Comrades, I love Eugene V. Debs probably as much as any man or woman here. I have slept with him at the same bed. I have eaten with him at the same table. We have drank from the same glass. We have worked faithfully together for the same movement for many years. Our names were coupled together for many years,

and I hope they will be coupled together in the future. Until about three years ago there were not in the Socialist movement any two men who were closer friends and comrades than Eugene V. Debs and Victor Berger. My personal friendship for Debs has not changed one iota. But stronger than my personal friendship is my devotion to the Socialist movement of America and to the International Socialist movement. (Applause.) The question tonight is not simply the goodness of Eugene V. Debs, but who is the best qualified banner bearer for our party in the year 1908, when everything is taken into consideration. If you nominate Eugene V. Debs I can promise you that we will try to get from 50,000 to 75,000 votes for him in the state of Wisconsin. (Applause.) If you nominate somebody else we will try to get the same vote. We will do our duty. You will hear from Milwaukee, Racine, Manitowoc, and elsewhere. (Applause.) This is no mere belief. We have made good in the past, and we will make good again. (Applause.) But, comrades, there is one thing to be considered. We do not want to be a one-man party. Now, as much as I love my friend, Gene—there is not any man whom I ever met in my life who can shake hands like Eugene V. Debs, not one (applause)—but we do not want to become a one-man party in the sense that the Democratic party is a Bryan party. Having grown up in this party, knowing many comrades individually and knowing the party collectively, I know we have a good many men who will make excellent candidates. I want to propose to you, comrades, a man whom I have known for the last eight years, who has been with us in Wisconsin for the last six years, a man who has been helping us to do things there—we are getting into the habit in Wisconsin of doing things there—and we want to keep on in that habit. We are doing some constructive work, which all of you will do everywhere within about four or six years. (Applause.) This movement is growing, and it is of great importance that the people everywhere should hear that we are not simply a party that knows how to criticize, but that we can do things ourselves better

than the other people, even under the capitalist system. (Applause.)

Comrades, in Milwaukee, Wis., we had a prejudice against preachers. Years ago when I edited a daily Socialist paper, I thought it was a part of my duty to get a fall out of them every little while. (Laughter.) And I tried to do my duty well. (Laughter.) But we found that the preacher after all is a proletarian in nine cases out of ten, especially the protestant preacher. I personally have found among the preachers some of the cleanest, noblest men I have ever met in my life. (Applause.) I am personally an agnostic; everybody knows that.

If you have any Socialist ministers and they are like the Socialist ministers in Wisconsin, if you don't want them, send them to us; we want them there. (Applause.) One of the very best of them is the comrade I want to mention now. You all know him by reputation. He has been east and west. He has worked in Denver, and he has spoken in Jersey City. Everybody who heard him liked him; everybody who heard him found him a clean man, a brainy man and an honest, upright, conscientious man. He bears the title "Honorable" because he is a member of the legislature of Wisconsin. But he deserves the name Honorable because he is honorable from every standpoint—I name the Honorable Carl D. Thompson. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, if there is any one thing that I have never expected to do, it is either to make a nomination speech or to second the nomination of a candidate for president on the national or any other ticket, and if I had my own way I would not be here. It may be that I am conceited in thinking that there are some things that I can say that have not been said, but it seems to me, whether I shall say them or some others, there are some points that should be considered.

Some of us who tonight are so enthusiastic at the mention of the name of Eugene V. Debs are classed as hero worshippers, as men who believe in only one man being capable

of carrying the red banner of Socialism for you in this campaign. I am not sure that I believe in phrenology, but I remember on one occasion of dropping into one of those places for a joke, and have always remembered what the fellow said, "You have a head that is practical." And I am here tonight speaking for Debs, not because it is Debs, not because I am a hero worshipper, but because I think this is the time and the year; if ever we needed Eugene Debs, it is right now. (Applause.) This is not the time for idle phrases. This is no time to conceal the truth. This is the time for plain speaking, for in my judgment this is the most critical campaign that the Socialist Party of America has ever gone into.

Now, I want to say briefly one or two things. In the first place, I want to say that I like and respect Carl D. Thompson as much as any man can. While I respect him, yet I am opposed to his nomination here tonight. In the first place, why do I mention it? Because it is a minor consideration, because we all know that there are certain elements in the Socialist ranks and others outside of the Socialist ranks who are Socialist and yet not in the Socialist party, that are in opposition to the idea of nominating Comrade Thompson. Some of the feuds, some of the struggles, some of the fraternal battles, if I may use that term, are still fresh in the minds of the membership. I am not here to say who is at fault, and I do not care, but I do know that we want a man in this campaign who can rally the working class to the red banner of Socialism, and do it with all the enthusiasm that a man is capable of. That means that we must have a man that has had no part in any of these battles within the ranks. I know it is better not to say this, but this is the time for plain speaking.

In the second place—and this is the most important reason—if I lived in Wisconsin, and if I were a delegate on this floor, I would drop dead trying to stop the nomination of Carl D. Thompson. I will tell you why. Because, in my judgment, the greatest calamity that can happen to the state of Wisconsin is to take Carl D. Thompson out of the Senate where

the people have put him. Let him stay there and finish his work, and four years from now, if he is alive, we will be in a position to consider him instead of somebody else.

I want to tell you something else frankly. I am not here to beat around the bush. I am not here to draw lines between working men and intellectuals, but I want to look you in the eye. I want to tell you that when it comes to a pick between the intellectual, the preacher, the professor, and the working man, that man who is fresh from the ranks of the working class and who in his every day life is in actual contact with the work and the struggle, I am with that man that I think the more nearly represents the working class. (Applause.)

And I want to tell you something else. It is no use dodging these things. The man that I second has not been mentioned in a caucus held this last week in Chicago. He needs no caucuses to make him the man who will receive the suffrages of the delegates of this convention, and if any of my friends want proofs they can have them. I want proofs they can have them. I want proofs they can have them.

To come to the point again, and important point. You have talked much about unity. I will tell you one way to make sure of unity, better than all the resolutions you can draw up. If there is any one man today in America that all factions of Socialists have a liking and respect for, whether they call themselves the Socialist Labor Party or the Socialist Party, it is this man Debs. (Applause.) If there is any one man that can command the respect and confidence of the A. F. of L. and the pure and simple, and at the same time of the industrialists, it is Eugene V. Debs.

One thing more and I am done. You may laugh, you may ridicule and sneer at the Hearst movement, but in my judgment, sneer as you may, you have it to face. That being the case, it is going to require the very strongest personalities we have in this movement at the head to rally the working class and fire them with enthusiasm. Look at it from the practical standpoint, and I say the longer you study it, the more you will agree with me. I have talked with Socialists the country over, and the longer

I study it, the more I see there is just one man this year for us, Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.)

Nomination of James F. Carey.

DEL. IDA CROUCH HAZLETT (Mont.): Comrade Chairman and comrades, I realize that in coming before this convention I come under the disadvantage of belonging to an enslaved part of society. I also realize that on account of that very fact, in the nomination of the candidate that I shall name here, perhaps his chances will be lessened on account of being nominated by a woman. And so it is that I come here for something else than to refer to the difficulties under which I labor at the present time, but which I believe a great principle is at stake here in the way the nominations are made at this Socialist convention of 1908, and I believe the comrades must have courage to go against what may be called the orthodox method that has prevailed in the American Socialist Party. To think that in the number of years that the American Socialist Party has been organized, a comrade cannot stand up here to name another candidate for the suffrages of those who are here this evening, without being hissed all over the hall, is a disgrace to the American Socialist movement. (Applause.) I look upon the one who dared to do it in the face of hissing, as a hero. We also, those of us who believe that every delegate on the floor of this convention has a right to have an opportunity to vote for a candidate that he chooses—we believe that we should be allowed to do so without having aspersions cast upon our honesty, which has already been done in sneering tones. We came with the intention not to force a candidate upon the attention of the convention, but desiring that an opportunity might be offered so that every delegate in this convention might express his own free will in regard to the candidates. And, my comrades, I will say, as another did who made a nomination for a presidential candidate as the standard bearer of the American Socialist Party here this evening, I will say that no matter who is the choice of this convention, I can say for Montana and every State here that I know of, that the final choice will receive

the unanimous approbation of the convention. But I also deplore the fact that comrades sneer at the division between the intellectuals and the proletarians in the nomination and choice of a standard bearer. But I stand here this evening to name a man that I hope you will not overlook because he was nominated by a woman. He would also be a hero to accept it, you know. (Applause.) It was not his fault, and you should not lay it up against him in the future. But I will say that in nominating this candidate, no one can accuse me of nominating a candidate for the so-called intellectuals. I stand here to name as a candidate for the suffrages and votes of this convention a representative man from the ranks of organized labor in the United States; a man who is known well and favorably to you all as an actual representative, as a working man in the ranks of those who do the world's work. I stand here to nominate as a candidate a man whose nomination will show the great body of organized labor throughout the country that the Socialist deserves the confidence and support of organized labor. I shall name the only candidate that has been named so far from the actual ranks of the working class. And so it is this evening, my friends, that I now place before you in nomination as the standard bearer of the Socialist party for 1908 the name of James F. Carey, of Haverhill, Mass. (Applause.) In placing the name of Comrade Carey before you I hope it will be distinctly understood that no aspersions are cast upon any other candidate. My admiration for Eugene V. Debs is as great as that of any man or woman here. Not only because of the enthusiasm, but because I realize what it means to American working class history; because I know the grand character of the man; I realize all this. When I place the name of James F. Carey before you I do so pre-eminently for this reason: we are approaching the most important campaign into which the working class of America has even been drawn. Organized labor is held in a position that was held by the organized labor of Great Britain seventy-five years ago. Our judges of the supreme and fed-

eral courts are handing down decisions similar to those handed down in England seventy-five years ago. We are approaching the dissolution of the organized working class of this country. We have the courts against us, we have the judges against us, we have the legislatures against us. The Socialist Party is still erect in America, the representative of the political aspect of organized labor. I have said here upon this floor before that instead of the Socialist party actually representing organized labor in this country, the working class of organized labor practically looks upon us with aversion in every State I know of in the United States with the exception of two States. In Great Britain the Socialist party failed to represent the interests of organized labor. The result was a new party formed by organized labor. We are on the verge of such a denouement ourselves, and unless we are able to attract organized labor in this campaign we are on the verge of a new party being formed, and our work will have to be done all over again. This time we set before the working class of this country candidates who can stand for fighting the injunction and every issue that has been thrust upon us by the capitalist class, meet it squarely upon its merits, show organized labor that we are fighting the injunction with them in the Socialist party, and it is for this reason that I ask your support of the candidacy of Comrade Carey. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I am thoroughly aware that your patience is almost exhausted, and I am going to treat you to a favor that you have not witnessed so far tonight, the favor of exceeding brevity. (Applause.) I knew that would be appreciated. If I were going to build a house I would get what I considered the best mechanic to do the job, even if I had had that same mechanic a number of times. In fact, the officer I had him the better. (Applause.) The officer I would like to get him again, as long as he would do the job. Now, we have got a job on hand. Somebody said here a while ago we had the capitalists on the run. I am not so sure

of that, but I would like to be, and I don't know anybody on earth that can start them running more quickly and more effectively and run them faster than the Tall Sycamore from Indiana. (Applause.)

I remember, when I saw that Tall Sycamore with that long finger of his pointing over the audience and those eagle eyes looking over the faces, and that gaunt figure straightening up, I made up my mind that that was the fellow that we were trying to get, and when I saw that sort of crouching attitude and I looked at him, I said, "We have got a job to do and we need help to do it."

Somebody said something about not having timber. Oh, yes; we have. If I am a carpenter, you understand, I look out over a pile here and over a pile there, and I want my scantlings to be good stuff. If I want the scantling that is on top I take it because it is the one I like best, and after that I take the next and the next. Now, here is a piece of scantling that I know to be good and strong. After awhile, if I am going to have the same kind of a job and see another scantling that looks as if it will serve, I will use the other scantling, and when I take Debs from the bunch it is just because it strikes my mind that he is the best one. Curious, ain't it? But it is so dog-goned practical. If Eugene Debs is the best, what is the use in taking another? You cannot find anybody else in America with that long finger. You cannot find anybody that will go across the stage like this (suiting the action to the word) and look you in the face like he can and make you wonder how in the name of goodness he did it.

So now, not to worry you any longer, I only say to you that that is the best scantling in the pile, so let us use it instead of one similar. We have none better, and if they are not, they ought never to be nominated. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Debs.

DEL. STRICKLAND: Indiana has not been heard upon this question, and we want to say a word just now to the comrades, and in what I am going to say, I am going to take the cue from the speaker that has

just presented the matter. We have a practical proposition. Comrade Debs is such a great loving soul, as the Indiana comrades all know, and if I had time I have a letter which I would like to read, but the hour is too late. It is a letter written, me just before coming to the convention. Comrade Reynolds has it. I say to the comrades everywhere, not only in Indiana, because we have to say he belongs to the United States rather than to Indiana (applause)—the practical proposition is this: The comrades think so much of him that they take too good care of him while he is on the road. The practical thing to do is to pick out one of his friends who can go with him, receive all flowers, attend the receptions and speak on his behalf; not that he needs private secretaries, but we need somebody to take a part of the load off his shoulders. Some traveling companion comrade ought to go with him every day and nearly every hour of the trip, and then since he is needed everywhere, start him early and make one great tour of the United States. Don't have him traveling day and night; give him comparatively short hauls. You can hardly get him to go into a Pullman anyhow. (Laughter.) Give him a chance. Give him a chance to have short runs, as many as can be made in the daytime. Let his traveling companion see that he is put to bed, and put him to bed at night at the right time. Let him have his rest. If that is done he will make in 1908 the greatest campaign that the Socialist party has ever had.

Second to Nomination of Thompson.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): We, the Wisconsin comrades, are accustomed to thinking things over pretty carefully, and then making the plan, driving the stakes, digging the trenches, laying the stones and putting up the structure. We have done it. (Applause.) Now, it has been said that if Thompson is taken from the Wisconsin campaign it will cripple us. I am sorry you do not know us better than that. Why, listen. You do not understand that 12th Assembly District. You have forgotten about Melms; he does not live there, but he lives in the city and helps us to carry on these campaigns. You have forgotten that

Seidel lives in the ward just next to that. You have forgotten about Welch. You have forgotten about some of these other men. You do not know much about Milwaukee anyway, but we do, because we are there and know what we have got. So I will tell you what we have got for this year, whether or not Thompson receives your nomination. We can, and I expect that we will, put Comrade Victor Berger in the Assembly this year, and that is pretty good. (Applause.) When I say we can, I want you to understand it, and that he is one who is accustomed to counting the votes after they are cast. I know what I am talking about. (Applause.)

Now, let me talk a little about the carpenter business. A political party has no reason for existence excepting to get political power. Where do you want to point to prove that the Socialist movement of America is capable of getting and using wisely political power under conditions obtaining in American politics? Where do you want to point? We are modest. I will let you say.

A DELEGATE: Wisconsin!

DEL. GAYLORD: Not always, I hope; no. That is why I want Thompson on your presidential ticket. Here is a man who has stood face to face not merely in the courts where he was at a disadvantage, but in the committee rooms, and on the floor of the State Legislature—face to face with the attorneys of the railroads, and beat them out. (Applause.) And the story he has to tell of the two-armed labor organization is a story that has thrilled every man and woman that ever heard it. Haven't you heard it? Well, I am sorry for you. I have sat as he has made his speeches there in the assembly, and I count it a privilege. This is no hero-worship. I have been on the job with this fellow twelve years, more or less, and I know what kind of tools he uses, and I am trying to tell you. I have heard him ram a whole proposition back down their throats, and he has made them swallow it. (Applause.) I heard him drive them into the bankrupt railroads that the United States government had put on their

leet and given back then to private ownership, and they shut up and simply voted him down, he and his comrades. He knows how to meet those people and tell the story of how to get political power and how to use it when you have got it. If they ask him, "What do you do," he will tell them what he has been given the privilege by the working class of doing on the floor of the State Legislature. (Applause.) That is a pretty good story to tell. And so I take great pleasure in seconding the nomination of Comrade Thompson. You understand why, now. We have been training men and women there, taking them and using them. We thought at first we could not spare him, but we looked around and we got others.

Now, this is my closing word as to why we want you to do it. We begin to feel that it is time that somewhere else outside of Milwaukee they should begin to rise up and threaten the possibility of a real political voting organization that represents the working class and can get and can use and is using, and will use rightly and fairly and intelligently political power for the people who need it and who must find a way to get it.

DEL. TUTTLE (Wis.): I come from Wisconsin, but I am going to get on the outside.

NAT. SEC. BARNES: I want to call attention to the fact that a man has been standing here for three-quarters of an hour.

DEL. TUTTLE: I object to Wisconsin being recorded until he is heard from.

DEL. O. F. BRANSTETTER: I move that no further seconds to nominations be heard, and that if there are any other States desiring to place new names in nomination, they be given an opportunity to do so, and that thereafter we immediately proceed to take a ballot. (Seconded.)

DEL. TUTTLE: Wisconsin is for Debs.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the house. Shall we hear from the comrade from Missouri? A motion has been made and seconded that we have no more seconds to nominations.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): One of the members of the Minnesota

delegation wishes to second the nomination of Comrade James Carey. I ask for a hearing for Comrade Kaplan for that purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to speak to the motion? You are out of order if you do not speak.

DEL. DAN WHITE (Mass.): That is an absolutely unfair motion to make. Comrade Carey is from Massachusetts. His nomination has been sprung tonight on the Massachusetts delegation. I know not what his position is in the matter, but I say that my love of Comrade Carey is just as boundless as yours for Debs, and we would like to show our appreciation for Comrade Carey by seconding his nomination.

DEL. BRANSTETTER: It was not my intention, I assure the comrades from Massachusetts and the delegates to this convention, to deprive any man of any just right or privilege upon the floor of this convention. But it seemed that for a moment I forgot that there were one or more candidates who had already been nominated and had not already received a second; and with the consent of my second and the house I will move that those not having already received at least one second be allowed to receive such second, and further new nominations may also receive the privilege of one seconding speech, but that further speeches be not allowed beyond that time. (Seconded.) It is necessary that some time between now and morning we must come to a vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

(Question called for.)

DEL. CARR (Ill.): I wish to say what I am to say now, not upon the matter of the nominations, not for the comrade of whom I am in favor, but in justice to us all, and chiefly to him who may be nominated by this convention. This motion to cut off discussion upon this matter is certainly unsocialistic and unfair, and I hope that whoever might be nominated in a Socialist convention after the gag rule had been applied would have the honor as an honest man to decline. (Applause.) And I want to say this, I yield to no man in my admiration of Eugene Debs, and I believe if Eugene Debs were nominated by a

convention where gag rule was applied, he would decline the nomination. Let us be fair. We can finish this business tomorrow if we cannot do it tonight. (Voices, "No.") That is all right. Then let us stay till we are done and not try to put somebody out. I want to serve notice on this audience that there are a number of comrades who have a right on this floor, who want to speak, and they ought to be heard, and I hope therefore, that this motion will be defeated in the interest of fairness.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you favor the motion, let it be known by saying "Aye," contrary "No." The "Ayes" appear to have it.

A division was called for, and the vote by show of hands resulted in 125 for and 24 against.

Nomination of Max S. Hayes.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): Comrades, I do not want to make a nominating speech. I simply wish to make a nomination. I wish to put in nomination as our presidential candidate for the election of 1908 a man who is an honor and a credit to the Socialist party and to the entire American labor movement; who is an honor and a credit to the entire International Socialist movement. I take great pleasure in nominating Comrade Max Hayes, of Cleveland, Ohio. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Carey.

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): Mr. Chairman and Comrades: I think after all we have about made up our minds. We all know how we feel. I say frankly that according to the sentiments as expressed upon the floor of this convention, as well as according to the sentiments expressed in this gathering—and I assume that the comrades in the back of the hall are all comrades—it seems to be Eugene V. Debs. (Applause.) Wait a little. But we are here as delegates, delegated to a Socialist convention. We must recollect that as Socialists we are not expected to be swayed from principle to a person. (Applause.) Now, wait a moment. If there was not upon this floor of the convention presented to you the spectacle of well nigh unanimity in the nomination of Eugene Debs, I would not rise here to second the nomination of another

comrade. If the result, however, is that we cannot get Eugene V. Debs, then I say, and I believe I am speaking for Minnesota, so far as relates to the other candidates, I second the nomination of James F. Carey, of Massachusetts.

Second to Nomination of Thompson.

DEL. STROBEL (N. J.): Last year about this time I came to Chicago and attended a Socialist meeting in the Garrick Theatre. I heard there a speech which fired my enthusiasm for Socialism again. You know that for eleven years I have been in the Socialist movement. You know that I have heard pretty nearly all the speakers. This speaker whom I heard was not any more eloquent than a good many speakers in the Socialist movement, and he was not any more sincere than many others in the Socialist movement. But this man had been through the mill; this man gave me new enthusiasm because of the story he had to tell of victories won, of triumphs won, of battles waged in the Legislature of his State.

A DELEGATE: A point of order.

The comrade is seconding the nomination of Comrade Thompson.

DEL. TUTTLE: If he does, then I want my place on that platform.

THE CHAIRMAN: For what purpose did you rise?

DEL. STROBEL: To second the nomination of Thompson.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are out of order. The nomination was seconded by Comrade Gaylord.

DEL. STROBEL: I thought I had a right to second it, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have not, under the rule.

DEL. O'HARE: I move to reconsider and suspend the rule and hear Strobell. (Seconded.)

DEL. ANDERSON (N. Dak.): The chair has no right to suspend the rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: It ought to be evident to anyone that when a motion carries by a vote of 125 to 25 there is no one trying to apply the gag rule that has been intimated by the comrade in this side of the house. (Applause.) A motion has been made to reconsider and been seconded. If you reconsider that motion say "Aye," contrary "No." The motion is not reconsidered.

A vote on the candidates was called for.

DEL. VOSS (Tenn.): I move that all nominations be closed and that we proceed to vote. (Seconded.)

DEL. STRICKLAND: I move that the tellers wait upon us with ballots.

DEL. CARR (Ill.) Mr. Chairman—THE CHAIRMAN: Do you rise to make a nomination?

DEL. CARR: The motion I want to make is perfectly proper. It is past midnight. We do not want to see a thing like this in a Socialist convention. I will not support a thing like this, no matter who does. I move to adjourn.

The motion to adjourn was seconded, but was lost.

Second to Nomination of Hayes.

DEL. WAGENKNECHT (Wash.): Only in common courtesy, and because the Washington delegation has considered the name of Comrade Hayes as a presidential nominee, and has considered the name of Comrade Debs as well, I wish to second the nomination of Comrade Hayes. He can decline, if he wishes, of course.

DEL. PEISER (N. Y.): I move that we now proceed to vote on the presidential candidates and that the vote should be by roll-call by States. (Seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I move an amendment, to make the roll-call by delegates instead of by States.

DEL. PEISER: I will accept the amendment.

DEL. STRICKLAND: I object. The motion was carried.

Hayes Declines.

DEL. COWAN (Ohio): I would like, in behalf of the Ohio delegation and Comrade Hayes, to withdraw the name of Comrade Hayes.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): I rise to a point of order: that no man that has been placed in nomination by the Socialist party has got a right to decline.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not well taken.

Carey Declines.

DEL. DAN WHITE (Mass.): In behalf of the Massachusetts delegation, the name of James F. Carey is withdrawn.

DEL. IDA CROUCH HAZLETT: Massachusetts has no right to with-

draw that, unless Carey authorizes it.

DEL. DAN WHITE: Today I said to Comrade Carey there was some sort of effort to make him a candidate against Debs, and he said that if he was nominated he wished to withdraw his name, and this is the reason I take this liberty.

DEL. HAZLETT: Let him stand like a man and give us a chance to vote.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: The names that stand will be Debs. Simmons and Thompson.

ROLL-CALL ON PRESIDENT.

A roll-call by delegates was then taken, with the following result:

FOR DEBS:—ALA., Freeman, Waldhorst; ARK., Hogan, Perrin, Penrose, Le Fevre, Snow; ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Bratford, McDewitt, Wheat, Woodby, Tuck, Cole, Merrill, Osborne, Johns, McKee, Baer, Starkweather; COLO., Buie, Maynard, Miller; CONN., Schiedge, Smith; DEL., Hensch; GA., Wilke, ILL., Collins, Fraenkel, Knopfmangel, Morgan, Kerr, A. M. Simons, Korngold; IND., Strickland, Reynolds, Dunbar, Kunath; IA., Rohrer, Hills; KAN., Wilson, Snyder, McAllister, Brewer, Katterfeld; MD., Lewis, Toole; MASS., Konikow, Dan White, Eliot, White, Mahoney; Putney, D'Orsay, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Menton, Hittunen; MINN., Peach, Kaplan, Thorsett, Ingalls, Anderson, Mack; MO., Garver, Pope, Callery; NEV., Miller; N. H., Wilkins, Arnstein; N. J., Goebel, Kearns, Killingbeck, Reilly; N. Y., Solomon, Wanabeck, Hillquit, Lee, Lewis, Slobodin, Paulfisch, Feldman, Hanford, Gerber, Furman, Vander Porten, Peiser, Spargo, Cole, Strebel, Fuhrman, Klencie; N. C., Quantz; N. D., Lampman, Anderson; OHIO, Prevey, Cowan, Bandlow, Vautrim, Jones, Ziegler, Hayes, Devine; OKLA., Hagel, O. F. Branstetter, Edwards, Dome, Block, Reynolds, Boylan, Willis, O'Hare; ORE., Vanner, Ryan, Barzee, Crabtree, Ramp; PA., Adams, Clark, J. E. Cohen, G. N. Cohen, Davies, Foley, Maurer, Moore, Ringler, Slayton, Schwartz, Young, Gozdzou; TENN., Voss; TEX., McFadin, Holman, Bell, Payne, Clark, Smith, Buchanan,

Rhodes, Thompson; UTAH, Syphers, Legett; VA., Dennett; WASH., Herman, Hendrickson, Brown, Wagenknecht, Krueger, Downie, Boomer, Martin, W. VA., Houston; WIS., Tuttle; WYO., O'Neill, Ryckman.

FOR CAREY:—ILL., Beryn; LA., Hymes; MAINE, Pelsey; MINN., Maattaia, Williams; MO., Hoehn, Brandt, Beltrons, Lipscomb; MONT., Graham, Hazlett, Wesleder, Ambrose, Petra, Harvey, Powers.

FOR THOMPSON:—ILL., Carr; IOWA, Brown; NEB., Porter, N. J., Kraft, Strobell; N. Y., Hunter; WIS., Gaylord, Weber, Thomas, Melms, Berger, Heath, Sandburg, Jacobs.

FOR SIMONS:—COLO., Floaten; IDA., Rigg, Chenoweth; ILL., Bentall, Brower, Lewis, Stedman; IA., Work, WIS., Thompson.

ABSENT:—ARK., Jones; FLA., Pettigrew; IDA., Untermann; ILL., Hunt, May, Wood, Simons, Walker; IA., Shank; KY., Seeds; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock, MICH., Lockwood, Storton; MINN., Rose, Nieminen; N. M., Metcalf; OHIO, Rodgers; S. D., Atwood, Knowles; VT., Wilson; WYO., Groesbeck.

Total Vote Cast, 198. For Debs, 159. For Carey, 16. For Thompson, 14. For Simons, 9.

DEL. BERGER: I believe I express the unanimous wish of my comrades from Wisconsin and outside, and I would move to make the nomination of Comrade Eugene V. Debs unanimous.

DEL. STEDMAN: I would like to second the motion on behalf of Comrade Simons and the comrades nominating him.

The motion to make the nomination unanimous was carried.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I now move that this convention instruct the Secretary to send a telegram to the presidential nominee, inviting him to appear at this convention as soon as possible, and at any rate, before we adjourn.

The motion was seconded and carried. A motion to adjourn was made and lost.

NOMINATION OF CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

The convention then proceeded to the selection of a candidate for Vice-President.

Nomination of Benjamin Hanford.

DEL. BANDLOW (Ohio): Having topped our work with the magnificent nomination of Eugene V. Debs, next in order is to give him a running mate that will be a credit, and so I place in nomination for Vice-President the name of Benjamin Hanford of New York. (Applause.)

Nomination of Caleb Lipscomb.

DEL. POPE (Mo.): Comrades and friends, there is no man in the Socialist movement that recognizes the laboring man in this great campaign more than I do. But I want to say to you that I come here this evening to represent the other great army, that thing that we must win if ever we win the battle of freedom. I come to you this evening—and it has all come to me since I came to this Convention—I have been studying and watching this great movement, and I heard the cry go up here—why, you have heard the leaders of this great movement tell you that there is a class of people that you must get into this great movement before you can win. And tonight I want to nominate one who represents that class; that talks in their language; that knows them and knows how they live, and knows how to make a campaign among those men. The men that I represent and want to get into the minds and hearts of these delegates are the men that rise at dawn of day and labor till the sun goes down. I want to nominate a man who will go before those people and will gather them into the Socialist movement. Where, in the name of common sense and reason, did you ever hear of a man being nominated that represented the farmers of this country? Comrades, we do not ever hear of any party in the United States going to the farming class and saying to them, "We recognize that you are the backbone of this country. If it were not for the farmers, the mills and the mines and the factories could not exist." I want to say to you that I come to advocate the farmers' cause. Let me

say this: To my mind this great movement will see in the future a great army of men coming into the Socialist Party, and that great army of men is going to come from the farmers of this country. I want to warn the industrial centers of this: Unless they rise and awake, the farmers will control the next Convention of the Socialist Party. (Applause.) I want here and now to place in nomination a man who recognizes that other great class that we have got to have. When I nominate that man, he will be from old Missouri and he will "show them." I nominate the grand old comrade, Caleb Lipscomb, of the State of Missouri. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Hanford.

DEL. MILLER (Colo.): I rise to second the nomination of a man whom you all know, and well: one who is able to carry the banner of Socialism alongside that of our gallant standard bearer. Something like 26 years ago this man left the rural districts to cast his lot in life in the great industrial centers of the country. From that time on down to the present, his hands, his heart, and his soul have been in the cause of organized labor. Back there in the dim ages of the past, when the only language of the working class was a groan, he had caught that groan, and, ah, in what eloquent speech it falls from his lips as an indictment against the ruling class. There is no man in this country better able to draw an indictment against capitalism. I think sometimes we overdo the matter in decrying the individual. This man's mind is as wide as the plains of our great country, his heart is as wide as human sympathy and human need, and his thought like the starry dome above. To know that man is to love him—an inspiration and a joy. There will be thousands of men, when this man's name is placed upon our standard by the side of that of Eugene Debs, who will say, "I do not know a great deal about Socialism, but I know that man fights and I know his heart. I believe in the man so much that I am willing to walk beneath the banner that he bears aloft." I second the nomination of New York's favorite son, Benjamin Hanford. (Applause.)

Nomination of James F. Carey.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I wish

to place in nomination a comrade for Vice-President. Some years ago I had occasion to take a little trip up on the coast of Massachusetts and there in one of the cities of that Bay State I met a comrade whom I found to have purely proletarian working-class aspirations and habits and customs from his childhood up. I found a man who scarcely ever had a cent in his pocket, because in the goodness of his heart he could never save a cent, even though he made good wages. I found a comrade who was respected and honored by the Socialists from one end of the country to the other—a man who as a proletarian in the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts was for five years the terror of the parliamentarians of the capitalist class; a man who served as the first common councillor elected on a Socialist ticket in the United States. I present the name of Comrade James F. Carey. (Applause.)

Nomination of J. W. Slayton.

DEL. RYAN (Ore.): Coming from the Far West, I wish to place in nomination a man of the Far East; a man who is familiar with the mining industries; who has been in the labor unions; who will carry the vote of the Western farmer as a candidate to run with Eugene V. Debs on the ticket for the nomination of the Vice-President, with Eugene V. Debs at the head of the ticket. I am no orator nor much of a speaker on this question, but I want to place in nomination the name of J. W. Slayton of Pennsylvania. (Applause.)

Second to Nomination of Carey.

DEL. GRAHAM (Mont.): On behalf of the Montana delegation in this Convention, I second the nomination of Carey.

Second to Nomination of Hanford.

DEL. LEWIS (Ill.): I do not want to make a speech; this is no time for speech making. But I wish it to go into the record of this Convention that I may register my opinion that so far as I am concerned I owe more to the man who has been nominated for this position than to any other man in the United States. For the hand of comradeship, for the stimulating example, for the encouragement wherever I met him in this

country, and I met him east and west and in the Middle States, I owe a personal debt. As a Socialist speaker getting tired and weary, I received through the mails long letters of seven and eight pages from one who was in a condition of health at that time that I knew it cost him pain and sometimes probably agony to write a few lines, but because I needed to be encouraged in working for the progress of Socialism, this man consented to do this work; and I have felt since I first met him in the city of San Francisco when he addressed an audience seven times this size, that this man of all others is my candidate and that the candidate on our ticket should be our comrade from New York, Ben Hanford. (Applause.)

has knowledge of the philosophy of Socialism; whose standing as a student of the whole world is acknowledged; whose talent and ability as an exponent of the working class issues and political action are known throughout the International movement; who has the love and confidence of the American movement, and who should be nominated for Vice-President of the United States, May Wood Simons of Illinois. (Great applause.)

Second to Nomination of Stedman.

DEL. KORNIGOLD (Ill.): I rise to second the nomination of Comrade Stedman. I think we cannot have a braver comrade, a comrade who understands the philosophy of Socialism better and who can present it in a fitter way than Seymour Stedman. (Applause.)

Nomination of G. W. Woodby.

DEL. JONES (Ohio): Comrades of the Convention, the nomination that I want to make for our Vice-President on this ticket should, I believe, receive the careful consideration of the Convention. The man whom I am to nominate is a man who is well known in the movement and has been in the movement for many years. The Socialist Party is a party that does not recognize race prejudice, and in order that we may attest this to the world, I offer the name of Comrade Woodby of California. (Applause.)

Second to the Nomination of Slayton.

DEL. HOLMAN (Tex.): Comrades, I rise to second the nomination of a running mate for Eugene V. Debs. Before I call attention to his running mate I wish to first call attention to the fact that when Eugene V. Debs' name is mentioned in my presence I too have felt the cold steel of the prison bars on my cheeks as Debs did at the Woodstock jail, and in the same cause for which Debs went there. I want to nominate a man that from his reputation will be a credit not only to the Socialist movement, but to Eugene V. Debs also. That man, near to me, is a tradesman of mine; he is the carpenter of Pittsburg, Pa., J. W. Slayton. (Applause.)

Carey Declines.

DEL. MAHONEY (Mass.): The Massachusetts delegation desire to extend their thanks to the Minnesota and Montana delegates for the nomi-

nation of Carey, but I desire at the present time to withdraw his name as a candidate for Vice-President. We have his absolute consent to withdraw his name.

Lipscomb also declined.

The names of Delegates Carey and Lipscomb having been withdrawn, a roll call was taken on the names of Delegates Hanford, Slayton, May Wood Simons, Stedman and Woodyby.

The roll-call resulted as follows:

For Hanford: ARK., Hogan, Le Fevre; CAL., McDevitt, Woodyby; COL., Bate, Maynard, Miller; DEL., Henck; GA., Wilke; ILL., Lewis, Morgan, Kerr; IND., Strickland, Reynolds, Dunbar, Kunath; KAN., Snyder, Brewer; MASS., Dan White, Eliot White, Mahoney, Putney, D'Orsay, Cutting, Fenton; MICH., Merton, Hittunen; MO., Brandt; Behrens, Gallery; Lipscomb; NEV., Miller; N. H., Wilkins, Arnstein; N. J., Goebel, Kearns, Kittingbeck, Kraft, Reilly; N. Y., Solomon, Wanhope, Hillquit, Lee, Lewis, Slobodin, Paulisch, Feldman, Hunter, Gerber, Furman, Vander Porten, Peiser, Spargo, Cole, Strebel, Fuhrman, Klenke; N. C., Quantz; N. D., Anderson; O., Prevey, Cowan, Bandlow, Ziegler, Hayes, Devine; OKLA., Hagel, O. F. Branstetter, Ross, Davis, Edwards, Dome, Block, Boylan, Wills, O'Hare; PA., Clark, J. E. Cohen, G. N. Cohen, Davies, Maurer, Moore, Schwartz, Young; R. I., Hurst; TEX., McFadin, Holman, Bell, Payne, Clark, Smith, Buchanan, Rhodes, Thompson; UTAH, Syphers, Leggett; VA., Dennett; WASH., Herman, Brown, Wagner, Knecht, Krueger, Downie, Boomer, Martin; W. VA., Houston; WIS., Weber, Tuttle.

Thorsett, Ingalls, Williams, Anderson; MO., Garver, Hoehn; MONT., Graham, Hazlett, Wesleder, Ambrose, Peura, Harvey, Powers; NEB., Porter; N. J., Stobell; TENN., Voss; WIS., Gaylord, Thomas, Melms, Berger, Thompson, Heath, Sandburg, Jacobs.

For May Wood Simons: ALA., Freeman; ARK., Perrin, Penrose, Shaw; ILL., Collins, Bental, Knopf-nagel; IA., Rohrer; KAN., Wilson, McAllister; LA., Hymes; ME., Pel-sey; MD., Lewis, Toole; MASS., Konkow; MINN., Maatala, Macki, O., Vautrim; OKLA., Winnie E. Branstetter; PA., Gozau.

For Slayton: ARIZ., Cannon, Morrison; CAL., Tuck, Osborne, Johns; Baurer; ILL., Stedman; KAN., Katterfeld; ORE., Ryan, Barzee, Ramp; PA., Adams, Foley, Ringler; WYO., O'Neill.

For Lipscomb: MO., Pope.

For Woodyby: O., Jones.

Absent: CAL., Merrill; CONN., Schiedge, Smith; FLA., Pettigrew; IDA., Untermann; ILL., Frenckel, May Wood Simons; IA., Shank; KY., Seeds; MASS., Carey, Hitchcock; MICH., Lockwood, Striton; MINN., Rose, Peach, Nieminen; N. M., Met-calf; N. D., Lampman; O., Rodgers; OKLA., Reynolds; ORE., Varner; Crabtree; S. D., Atwood, Knowles; VT., Wilson; WYO., Groesbeck, Ryckman.

Not Voting: N. Y., Hanford; PA., Slayton.

Total vote cast, 185.

For Hanford	106
For Stedman	42
For May Wood Simons	20
For Slayton	15
For Lipscomb	1
For Woodyby	1

Delegates Slayton, Stedman and Kearns united in moving to make the nomination of Hanford unanimous, and it was carried.

The Convention then at 1:58 a. m. adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m.

SIXTH DAYS SESSION

The convention was called to order at 10 o'clock by Asst. Secretary Strickland.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: I have a resolution here from New York in favor of unity, bearing the seal of the Socialist Party Unity League. This matter has been disposed of in the convention.

DEL. GERBER (N. Y.): I do not know that there is anything like a Socialist Party Unity League in the city of New York. Hence, this communication comes from the outside of the party entirely. I move that it be laid on the table.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: It is moved that this message be laid upon the table. Those in favor will say aye. The ayes have it and the matter is laid upon the table.

Del. Bandlow, of Ohio, was elected chairman for the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: The convention adjourned last evening after the nominations were completed, pending the further consideration of the report on Platform. The report of the Committee on Platform therefore is the first order of business this morning, and unless otherwise ordered by the convention, that committee has the floor.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PLATFORM RESUMED.

DEL. A. M. SIMON (Ill.), reporting for the Platform Committee: I will now read the Program:

"As measures calculated to strengthen the power of the working class in its fights for the realization of its ultimate aim, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

"1. The national ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamships and all other means of transportation and communication.

"2. The national ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist.

"3. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and waterpower.

"4. The scientific re-forestation of timber lands and the reclamation of swamp lands so re-forested or reclaimed to be permanently reclaimed as part of the public domain.

"5. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage, as guaranteed by the constitution.

"6. That religion be treated as a private matter, a question of individual conscience.

"7. The improvement of the industrial conditions of the workers:

"(a) By shortening the work day in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery;

"(b) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week;

"(c) By securing a more vigorous inspection of workshops and factories;

"(d) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age;

"(e) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor, and of all un-inspected factories;

"(f) By abolishing official charity and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accidents, invalidism, old age and death.

"8. The extension of inheritance taxes graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin.

"9. A graduated income tax.

"10. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction.

"11. The initiative and referendum.

proportional representation, and the right of recall.

"12. The abolition of the Senate.

"13. The abolition of the veto power of the President.

"14. That the constitution be made amendable by majority vote.

"15. Government by majority. In all elections where no candidate receives a majority, the result should be determined by a second ballot.

"16. The enactment of further measures for general education and for the conservation of health.

"17. The elevation of the present bureau of education into a department, and the creation of a department of public health.

"18. The separation of the present bureau of labor from the Department of Commerce and Labor and its elevation to the rank of a department.

"19. That all judges be elected for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions should be curbed by immediate legislation.

"20. The free administration of justice."

Then there was another section which was taken from our last year's platform: "Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry, and thus come into their rightful inheritance."

Now I will proceed to read seriatim. THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, we will take up this part of the platform section by section.

DEL FIELDMAN (N. Y.): I have an amendment to offer. It is generally admitted, even by the capitalist class, that we are now in the midst of a crisis, far the worst industrial crisis that the American people have ever passed through. Something can and must be done right now, and if this convention adjourns without including some plan, particularly in the general program, that deals concretely with the issue and the necessity of the minute and the hour we shall not have done our duty to the working class of this country.

If you look over this platform you will find not a single immediate demand. The program is divided into general demands, under the headings of industrial

demands and political demands, and that ends it.

Now, we need an immediate demand under a separate head, that should be included in the program, and I wish to present to you such an immediate demand. I want to say in justice to a comrade who is a lone delegate from one of the smallest states in the Union, I want to say that Comrade Fred Hurst of Rhode Island is the author of this, and with slight changes I have undertaken to bring the matter before you and present it to your careful attention. It deserves your undivided attention and consideration. This demand is already seconded by a delegate from Massachusetts. The title of this immediate demand is: An immediate demand for the employment of unemployed labor. It reads:

"The government shall employ every willing worker, their hours and wages to harmonize with the scale established by organized labor for similar work. Our government, by the right of eminent domain, shall take over such property as may seem necessary to promote the general welfare, build, equip and operate railroads, now the post roads, mines, factories, and provide any other useful work sufficient from time to time to employ all who need and apply for work; that all work be paid for by the day, and no work be let out under private contract; that all money needed to put into effect the foregoing, with all accessories needful for their successful operation, be provided by Congress in harmony with the United States constitution, which reads (Article I, Sec. 8): 'Congress shall have power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof.' All money issued for this purpose shall be full legal tender and paid by the national, state and municipal governments direct to the workers for services rendered. The national government to extend credit to the states and municipalities at cost. The marketable products to be sold to consumers at the cost of production and distribution, and that the price to the public for services be practically the cost of maintaining and operating the same."

I move the adoption of that as a separate plank in our general program, and that it be the very first plank under the heading, "Immediate Demand for the

Employment of Unemployed Labor." I wish the floor to speak to my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I ask the indulgence of the convention to have read the telegram to Eugene V. Debs.

ASST. SEC. STRICKLAND: This is the telegram that was ordered last night, and is signed by the secretary, as directed by the convention last night. Eugene V. Debs,

"Girard, Kansas.

"Your comrades in convention assembled have this night, by unanimous vote and with old-time enthusiasm, nominated you for the presidency. I am instructed to express to you their appreciation of your magnificent services in the cause of the exploited workers. We pledge you our every support and our devoted cooperation. Hanford will run with you. Come without delay, at once, that we may all see you and hear you, and shake your hand before the convention adjourns.

(Signed) "FREDERIC HEATH, "Sec'y Socialist Convention."

Del. Fieldman's amendment was declared out of order.

DEL. SIMONS (reading): First: National ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamships and all other means of transportation and communication."

I move the adoption of that plank.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I move you that before railroads are mentioned in this separate plank that there be inserted the words "all the land." The land is just as necessary as machinery, railroads, telegraphs and everything else. The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that there be added the words "all the land."

DEL. THOMPSON: There is a provision for the ownership of the land later on.

DEL. WILKE (Ga.): I move that the word "public" be substituted for "national."

DEL. WORK (Iowa): Is the motion to insert "all the land" before the house?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is.

DEL. WORK: Then I want to speak against it. We surely do not propose to put into this platform a declaration in favor of the public ownership of land that is used by people who are living on it themselves. If we do that we declare for public ownership of every bit of

land in the whole country. We decided yesterday that the Socialist Party only wants collective ownership of those things which are used for exploitation. When land is used by the person who lives on it, it is not used for exploitation and does not need to be collectively owned."

DEL. JOHNS (Cal.): I am opposed to the amendment. If we adopt anything of this kind we should have an illustrative preamble showing what we mean and what this means to the working class. It might be done by citing the example of such work in Japan, showing the wonderful advantages to the working class of government ownership. There the railroads with a few exceptions are government owned. All the telegraph and telephone lines and the cigar manufacturing industry are government owned.

I don't think I need to tell you who were so terrified a day or two ago lest the Japs might bring our standard of living down that the working class in Japan is not living in luxury as a result of the government ownership in Japan. This would look very pretty in a reform platform. William—also Randolph—Hearst will see that there are slanders of that sort of thing in the platform of his independent party. I saw it stated in the paper that the Democratic party had stolen a plank from the Socialist platform.

A DELEGATE: That is true.

DEL. JOHNS: Well, it belonged in the Democratic platform and therefore it went there, and should not have been in the Socialist platform at all. Let us leave it to them to put those things in. In all these planks and the other planks that are suggested, the ghosts of dead parties rise before us in this convention, and if we don't want our poor ghosts wandering around we have got to put in our platform things which the capitalist party will not steal and dare not steal.

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): It appears to me from the statements made by Comrade Work that the collective ownership of land is not a part of Socialism. He made the statement, if I mistake not, that land is not a means of exploitation. That was the statement made by Comrade Work.

DEL. WORK: My statement is that when land is used by its possessor and

occupier alone it is not used for exploitation, when he does the work upon it. We only want collective ownership of such land as is used for exploitation.

DEL. CLARK: In the main I agree with Comrade Work, but it is evident the convention has got it into its mind that we do not stand for public ownership of the entire means of production and distribution. I am a revolutionist, and as such I stand for the collective ownership of the entire means of production and distribution. Just so long as we leave in the hands of the exploiting class, the class which exploits the working class, one penny that they produce, just so long we are in no position to say that the Democrats or the Hearst people are making different demands from us. I repeat again that I stand for collective ownership, not of the larger part of the land, but collective ownership of the entire earth. If we begin to compromise with the capitalist class, there is no way that we believe in the collective ownership of the earth can present the principles of the Socialist Party which the majority of the working class of America, who are already disinherited, would listen to. I know that you are going to make fine distinctions. When the immediate demands were introduced I stood against every demand. I stood for revolution. I know you are going to say when you follow me that I am an impostor, that I say if you go along the lines you propose you will not reach the co-operative commonwealth, the ideal for which we stand, until the earth shall be no more. There is no doubt that the steps we are taking in this convention as to an immediate demand have a strong tendency to lead us to state capitalism in industrial government. I say now I don't want to be mistaken. I don't believe in a political state. I believe in government being organized along industrial lines, and that the political state must give way to the industrial commonwealth. Just so long as we have political government, just so long shall we have political despotism. Politics will creep in. You may say that he believes in democracy. I say that if the capitalist state has been used in the perpetration of private property, the only way we can get what we are after is to constantly work for the co-opera-

tive commonwealth based on industrial lines.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Politics is no more essentially and inherently corrupt than a machine is essentially and inherently corrupt, because it is used now for the exploitation of the working class, any more than land is essentially and inherently corrupt because it is used for the exploitation of the working class. It all depends upon whose hands the political power is placed in. The same political power that is used now corruptly for the purpose of exploiting the working class becomes a weapon for the liberation of the working class and for overthrowing the corruption of politics in the present state. In some points I agree with the previous speakers. When you adopted your platform, you said you wanted collective ownership of the means of production and distribution that are used for exploitation. You adopted that with a whoop and now it comes back to you and you are considering it. You cannot reject in your program what you have adopted in your platform. That means that if a capitalist owns three miles or a big corporation owns ten miles, and it is not used for exploitation that we don't want it to be owned collectively. If you say that the farmer owns his little farm, which he does not own for exploitation except from his wife and children, you say the Socialist party does not concern itself with that. The farmer is an exploiter of his wife and children. But you say because the farmer does not use that land for exploitation generally, it is not to be owned collectively. I say the Socialist movement of the world stands for collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution. We should not make any fine distinction. I do not care whether you declare in the program or in the preamble, or in the demand—I say if you strike it out in the program, you must strike it out in the demand and the preamble.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): Let us try to look carefully at this matter. I hold in my hand the platform of the Social Democratic party of Germany; the platforms of the Socialist parties of Austria, of Belgium, of France, the Independent Labor party of England, together with the speeches of the great

men of the Socialist movement of the world.

It has been said on this floor that the Socialist party stands for certain things the world over, but let us look at the actual program and find out what they stand for. The proposition here is that the Socialist party must stand for the collective ownership of every and all means of production and distribution.

It has been said that the Socialist party cannot stand for the proposition that the small farmer shall be allowed to retain possession of the farm land. I want to stop long enough to give you the actual words of those leaders of the Socialist movement.

Every Socialist party in the world stands for immediate demands, and if you will read the platforms of these Socialist parties of the world you will see that is true.

Where does the International Socialist movement stand on the land question? In Germany the comrades at their congress appointed three different committees to study the question of agriculture with reference to Socialism, and on these committees they have placed the best men of the Social Democracy of Germany, and at Stuttgart they brought in their report.

Here are such men as Liebknecht and Bebel and the other great leaders of Germany. What is their position on this? Must we stand here and say to the farmer that we propose to have the collective ownership of every little bit of land no matter how much it is? I say no. I say the Socialist party does not stand for that at the present time anywhere in the world.

DEL. CLARK (Tex.): Do you believe in a private title to land?

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Thompson has the floor.

DEL. CLARKE: May I ask you a question? Do you believe in a private title for land, or do you believe their possession and occupancy shall determine the title?

DEL. THOMPSON: I am trying to explain to the convention the international position on this question.

DEL. CLARK: That is dodging the issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please be in order? I want to say that discussions between the speaker and other

delegates who wish to ask questions is not provided for in the rules.

DEL. THOMPSON: The comrades are asking for the words of these leaders. Kautsky says the little farm industry may well remain private property. Kautsky further says as yet no Socialist who is to be taken seriously has ever demanded that the farmer should be expropriated.

Vandervelde of Belgium says, and the great leaders of Socialism agree in saying that there is no ground for bringing pressure to make the peasant form of property come into the collective domain.

Jaures says that Socialists have never expected to force the present farm property into communistic ownership, and in the same work Jaures quotes Liebknecht to the same effect.

That is the position of the International Socialist movement. The vital point in Socialism is this: Whatever is used for exploitation must be collectively owned. A carpenter's kit of tools are means of production, but are not means by which men are exploited, and therefore may safely be left in private hands. The principle of Socialism is simply the collective ownership of those things which in private hands are means by which those private owners exploit the rest of the people and that is all we want to get hold of.

DEL. SPARGO (N. Y.): May I ask the Chairman of the Platform Committee a question, whether or not the committee contemplates that in the case of the holding of immense tracts of land not for exploitation, but for private pleasure parks, as in the Adirondack mountains, we should not socialize that land. There is land that is not used for exploitation, thousands of acres of the most beautiful country in the world, that is not used for exploitation, but kept away from the use of the people for the gratification of private luxury.

DEL. SIMONS (Ill.): I would say that the Committee is not so much concerned with the Utopian future as it is with the things that we are fighting for at the present moment. If those great tracts of land—personally I am in favor of taking them away—if those tracts of land stand in the way of the enjoyment of the workers of the country when they get control, they will take them,

and they will not ask what we said about it at this convention, either.

DEL. HOEHN (Mo.): There are two factions in this convention. One is for immediate demands and one is for revolutionary, scientific Socialism, the collective ownership of the means of production and nothing else. I favor the report of the committee.

Now, the comrades on the other side take the ground that this is not in line with International Socialism. I want to ask, do you realize that that position is a Utopian position, an anarchistic position, nothing else?

I want to say that it is a proper immediate demand to demand the nationalization of the railroads. It is a proper immediate demand to demand the municipalization of the street railroads. It is a proper immediate demand to demand a labor law for protection of men, women and children in factories.

Will you dare to get up here to oppose a law for the protection of men and women and little children in factories? If you do, you are certainly not in line with the International Socialist program.

I will tell what it means when you say that you want the collective ownership of the earth. You might just as well say that you are in favor of the collective ownership of the moon.

DEL. A. M. SIMONS (Ill.): This discussion does not belong here in connection with the matter now before the house, but it has been allowed to proceed. Year after year Socialist conventions suffer from this same disease, but each year, I am glad to say, it gets less virulent.

I admit that at one time I had a slight attack myself, but I am thankful to say I have recovered, and I hope I begin to realize and that others will begin to realize at last that we are a party engaged in a class struggle, and that that class struggle is not being fought tomorrow, nor in the cooperative commonwealth, but is being fought right here and now, month after month and year after year.

I believe that some of us have begun to realize that we are revolutionary party with our acts and not alone with our mouths. I believe that a few of us realize that we have passed from the Utopianism of Sir Thomas Moore and we have begun to do something more than paint pictures of the com-

ing Socialism, as Marx calls it, and have got down to the cold facts and are laying the foundation for the cooperative commonwealth here and now.

I want to tell you, whether you realize it or not, that you are with Babeuf, Cabet, Fourier and Bellamy and all the rest of them when you make your revolutionary Socialism rest upon a contest as to which one of you can paint the most radical, the most far-reaching, the most beautiful picture of what we will do some time in the future.

You are not helping class conscious scientific Socialism when you say that your Socialism consists in the declaration that we want all of the instruments of production and distribution. That does not constitute scientific revolutionary or class conscious Socialism; it constitutes Utopianism.

To be sure we all still hold to all that was good, all that was true, all that was best in the Utopian movement and we therefore hold before our eyes the time when we shall control and actively administer—not everything—I don't want collective ownership of tooth brushes—but all of those things that are used for exploitation, or that stand between us and the enjoyment of anything that we want.

The program of collective ownership is not for the purpose of making revolutionary phrases, but is for the purpose of stopping exploitation, and stopping as much of it as we can now, and because of these facts, because I am a revolutionary Socialist and not a Utopian, because I am class conscious, believing in the class struggle here and now, I ask you to put aside this slight attack of measles so that the Socialist movement may go forward in the realization of the fact that we have got a fight now, a big fight, that exists all over this country and that it is big enough to keep us busy all this summer without worrying about the distant future.

DEL. HERMAN (Wash.): We revolutionary Socialists of the Pacific coast are also for immediate demands, but we are for immediate demands that will improve the conditions of the working class and not for immediate demands that will perpetuate the interests of the weaker portion of the capitalist class as against the stronger portion of the capitalist class.

We are not in favor of the nationalization of railroads or telegraphs. They have nationalized railroads in Russia, and nationalized telegraphs in Russia, but who is the government? The czar, and the feudal aristocracy, the rising capitalist class. Those railroads and telegraphs are run in the interests of the class who own the government.

We have government ownership of the postoffices in this country, and do you tell me, fellow wage-workers, that you have a voice in the administration of the postoffice? Why the men and women in the service of that institution are denied even the right to organize.

Yes, we are for immediate demands, but we are for demands that will not reduce the taxes of the controlling classes, or add to the taxes and expenses of the struggling workers; we are for immediate demands that will take away by the right of eminent domain, through the power of taxation, a portion of the wealth that the capitalist class has exploited from us, to use that as Comrade Fieldman suggested to provide employment for the victims of the capitalist class.

DEL. SIMONS: I just want to say inasmuch as this unemployed question is coming up again and again that the committee has a plank drafted on that subject and it will be here in a few minutes. Don't think that the committee overlooked that point.

DEL. KORNOLD (Ill.): It would have been a good thing if some of the delegates who came to this convention had investigated matters before they talked about them. If the comrade who has spoken before me had investigated the government ownership of railroads he would have found that wherever government ownership of railroads has been applied it had benefited the working class. Over in Switzerland—the working people of Germany and of Switzerland, work ten hours a day where the American people, the working people on the railroads in America, could not get sixteen hours.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): That is right.

DEL. KORNOLD (Ill.): They worked eight hours in Germany under the government and they received higher wages than they received from the railroads in America despite the fact that the general wage scale is higher in

America. Do the comrades know this? We Socialists know that if you investigate the facts, you will find that government and municipal ownership practically under all circumstances lessen the burdens of the working class, and practically in every case lower the hours and raise the wages of labor.

Professor Parsons investigated some time ago municipal ownership in America, and he found that wages under municipal ownership were higher than wages under private ownership. He found that the hours of labor under municipal ownership, were $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours less than under private ownership in the same line. You will find that in Switzerland and in practically every country in Europe, or for that matter on the globe, where the government is in the hands of the capitalist class, still the working people have been able to secure eight hours when we are not able to secure sixteen hours on privately owned railroads. While we Socialists want government ownership of railroads, we at the same time work for ownership of the government. These two things go together. We do not mean to leave the government in the hands of the capitalist class. But while we assimilate gradually these different means of production and distribution we, at the same time, gradually assimilate the government itself.

DEL. WILLIAMS (Minn.): I have never in my life been accused of being an opportunist. In fact, in many sections of the country where I have been because of the position I had taken I have been called an impossibilist. That is not true, however. I believe in immediate demands. I believe that there is a certain line at which we must draw the mark, and over which we must not step in our immediate demands for the benefit of the middle class. I believe in a program of immediate demands. I believe in the ultimate assimilation of all the means of production and distribution, all the land and machinery as an ultimate end. But I believe that for an immediate program, in order as the platform states to strengthen the power of the working class in its fight for this ultimate aim, we need these immediate planks. I believe, as the Comrade from Washington stated, that the Socialist party ought to advocate these immediate planks that will strengthen the work-